

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS.

EDITED BY
ANDREW J. PALM AND HENRY RANDALL WAITE.

Vol. V.,
JULY TO DECEMBER,
1894.

etc.

NEW YORK:
ANDREW J. PALM & CO.,
114 NASSAU STREET.

G

20112

JA3
.A5

~~320.5~~
~~a.8~~

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS.

JULY, 1894.

THE BOSTON MUNICIPAL LEAGUE.

BY SAMUEL B. CAPEN.

IT HAS been said that the movement in favor of Municipal Reform, which is extending from one end of this country to the other, is the most important of any which has come before the American people since the overthrow of slavery. This at first sight seems like an extreme statement; and yet, when we realize that at the present rate of increase very early in the next century our large cities will control the nation, we begin to have some conception of the necessity of having our city governments everywhere of the highest character. The national safety really depends upon the proper government of our large cities. De Tocqueville has said that "municipal institutions are to liberty what the primary school is to science." Our best citizens everywhere have begun to believe that Mr. Bryce was right when he said that the "government of great cities is the conspicuous failure in the American Republic."

In the organization of our Municipal League, we have, for the present, at least, limited our membership to two hundred; believing that a comparatively small body has more individual responsibility, and is less likely to be turned aside from its legitimate purpose, than if its membership were greater. With a limited membership, organizations are more likely to be represented by their best men, who can consider problems, discuss questions, and reach results better in a small body than in a mass meeting. //

There are some things that must be conceded at the outset.

First.—The city is *not a little state*, but a corporation, and the

simpler it can be in its government the more efficient. But while it is a corporation, it should not be *soulless*. Ordinary corporations exist for money-making and profit-sharing, but the city has a higher purpose. It should be governed not only on business principles, but it should never forget that it has a higher end,—of protecting the weak, of caring for the needy and the unfortunate. In other words, it should have some moral earnestness and force; and there is moral force enough in every city to improve many things, provided that moral force was not so often latent, and, therefore, inoperative.

Second.—We must recognize the *lack of information* on municipal matters, of great numbers in our large cities, who, therefore, can be easily led by selfish and designing men. The cure for all this is *education* in municipal affairs.

Third.—We must also recognize at the outset the *apathy and indifference* of many of the most intelligent people in our cities. They are so interested in money-making and pleasure-seeking that they prefer to grumble and pay their taxes, and permit other people to shape public affairs. Washington Gladden has well said that “the blight upon our municipal patriotism is mercantilism!”

Fourth.—We must remember that neither of the two great parties has any special principles to guide in municipal affairs. Their principles apply almost wholly to national and state interests; but men have been so much accustomed in all the past to work on party lines, even in municipal matters, that time will be required before they will, in sufficient numbers, be willing to vote individually on municipal election issues. Mr. Seth Low has put this truth admirably when he says, “We are partisans before we are citizens.”

Fifth.—This League is to be *absolutely non-partisan*, and its discussions are *limited* to questions relating to municipal matters. We are not organized for the political advancement of our own members, for we have no wish for public office. We are trying first to understand better the problems of municipal government, and then to be helpful in solving them. We have, therefore, no desire at present, to nominate candidates for office, PROVIDED

men of character and persons fit for public trust are nominated by others. When this is not the case, we shall make our protest by suggesting, if possible, other names.

Sixth.—It seems almost unnecessary to add that in a movement of this kind there will be no use or place for the local "boss" and the ward politician of either party. They are, as a class, thoroughly selfish; they care only for themselves, and they have no place in a business corporation.

Seventh.—We must also recognize the great power there is in public opinion if it can only be aroused and brought to bear upon municipal problems; and this public opinion can be depended upon always in favor of the best things. Mr. Moorfield Story was right when he said at the Philadelphia convention that we should be surprised "if we could in each city see the photographs of men who constitute the rings of which we complain, and could read their histories; we should be ashamed of our subjection. Municipal reform is only a question of will." It certainly is true that there are far more good men in every city than there are bad, and that the number who desire a corrupt government is very small. The poor man is even more interested than the rich in good city government. He needs good public schools, for he is obliged to send his children to them; while the rich man, if he is dissatisfied, can send his to some private institution. The poor man especially needs clean streets and good sewerage, for he must stay in the city through the heat of the summer; while the rich man can take his family to the mountains or to the seashore. We only need to get all those who are interested in the best things to work together, and the whole problem is solved. The question is sometimes asked in our cities, who can control the saloon vote? We wish, on the other hand, to be in perfect touch with the *moral interests* in our community, and find out who is the most worthy to represent that vote.

Eighth.—The first aim, therefore, of this League should be to secure the confidence of the community, by helping to solve the great social, civic, economic, and industrial problems which confront us at the present time. We must prove our right to ex-

ist by our unselfish interest, before we can expect to be a power for good.

With these thoughts in mind as representing in some measure our good purposes, it may be proper to consider for a moment some of the questions which are immediately before us for our consideration, remembering that they are questions on which there may be differences of opinion. I would suggest,

First.—Is it not possible to separate further our national and state, from our city, elections? Coming within a few weeks of each other, there is still a chance for political trading. Furthermore, men get so excited and aroused along party lines in November, that it is very difficult for them to forget these considerations by the second Monday in December.

Second.—Many of us feel that it is *unwise to elect a mayor every year*. Would it not be far wiser to elect him for a term of three years? All citizens would feel more strongly than they do now the importance of the election if it was to be filled for a longer term. Many people cannot be aroused when the election is an annual one. Furthermore, the mayor himself would be less hampered, would be more free from the influence of politicians, would be better able, also, to do the best things, if he was conscious that the term was for three years.

Third.—Many feel that our city government would be more efficient if we had *one representative council instead of two*. Wherever it has been tried this has proved true. In that case the one board should be larger than our present board of aldermen, should be chosen as the school board is, for three years, one third only going out each year, so that it should be a continuous body, with a certainty that two thirds of its members would be familiar with the city's interests. Hon. Charles Francis Adams has stated the point clearly, "that this municipal council is generally the weak point in our municipal government, and that improved methods in the executive department in some of our cities, have accomplished less than they otherwise would have done if the municipal legislatures had been more efficient." The argument that has been used for continuing two bodies has been, first, that it is more difficult to c

rupt two bodies than one ; and, second, that one acts as a check upon the other. In answer to this, it should be stated that if there is to be but one board, it should be of sufficient size not to be easily susceptible to improper considerations ; and, secondly, it should be provided that appropriations, and other questions of great importance, should not be acted upon without two readings, several days apart, to give opportunity to citizens, through the press and otherwise, to make their protest heard if occasion should require.

Fourth.—Many of us feel that we have *too many departments and commissions* for the proper conducting of our city business. We do not wish to be misunderstood as making a sweeping condemnation of all commissions, for there are some departments whose interests are so varied that it would be almost impossible to find any one man who could be expected to properly care for them. The Rapid Transit Commission is one illustration of this, and some others might be given ; but we feel that it is possible to reduce the number very materially, and simplify the city's business to a considerable extent. There are various objections to too many commissions. It is supposed to be an attempt at non-partisanship by having both parties appear upon the commission ; but it often practically keeps alive, in its most active form, just those political distinctions we want to destroy in the management of the corporation called the City of Boston : instead of being *non-partisan* boards, they are *bi-partisan* boards. Again : Where there are several members upon a commission, if anything goes wrong it is very difficult to fix the responsibility anywhere, as the blame is shifted from one to another. It is important in municipal affairs to clearly define responsibility. The argument for so many commissions often seems to proceed from a feeling of distrust, and from the fear that power is not safe in one man's hands ; but it is certainly possible to find men who can be trusted. We should not be afraid of one-man power in a government of the people, for we can certainly get at one rascal, if one gets into office, and turn him out very much easier than we can reach several men scattered through various departments and capable of doing no end of mischief. In busi-

ness corporations we do not have three treasurers or auditors; we must trust somebody. We want to know definitely who the man is, and then hold him to strict account, giving him no opportunity to make the plea that he was not to blame when mistakes were made, because there were so many others whom he could not control. For judicial work it is often wise to have several men who seek for truth from different standpoints; but for executive matters one man is usually better than three. Furthermore, if the number of departments and commissions were reduced, and a single man put at the head of the departments, we could pay the one man a very much higher salary, and still save the city some expense. By paying higher salaries the city would be able, also, to get the very best men, and there would be more likely to be a permanency about the position, and men would feel that they had an opportunity to do good service and make a commendable record for themselves. The abolition of some of these departments and commissions and the making of all offices more permanent, would materially decrease the amount of patronage which is a disadvantage to all who use it, especially to those who use it selfishly. We have nearly forty departments at the present time, with separate appropriations. Might there not be a grouping of some of these departments under one head, thus promoting greater efficiency, and, possibly, greater economy? Such changes as these have been made in some cities apparently to advantage. In the city of Cleveland there was up to a recent date thirteen boards or commissions, of from three to five members each. By a new charter these have all been abolished, and there are now seven departments, with one man at the head of each, appointed by the mayor, and confirmed by the council; viz., public works, police, fire, charities and correction, law, accounts, and schools. Every election is therefore so vital to the citizens of Cleveland, that instead of a little handful of politicians attending the caucuses as formerly, it is stated that now about three fourths of all the voters attend, with the result, we are told, of having better men elected.

As a consequence of these changes, in two years the net debt

has been reduced, taxes have been reduced thirteen per cent, water rates twenty-one per cent, and gas twenty per cent. This whole matter seems, at least, worthy of consideration.

In the same connection would there not be an advantage if Boston had a *board of estimate and apportionment* as there is in some other cities, consisting of the mayor, the chairman of the board of aldermen, the auditor, and perhaps some business man nominated by the board of trade?

If the estimates were made in this way, would not the different departments be more likely than now to have their just proportion? And would not the strife for so much money for each district, or each department, without proper regard for the needs of others, be done away?

Fifth.—We ought, if possible, to use all our influence to increase *civic pride* in our city, and to induce our very best citizens to be willing to accept public office. In the recent past, men who have been willing to make sacrifices of their private interests for the public, have been too often subjected to the sneers of friends. We ought to try to change all this; for when a man is called upon by his fellow-citizens to serve in the city government, it is just as honorable as to be a director in a bank or a professor in Harvard University. We trust that by keeping this truth constantly in mind it will lead to the nomination, as a rule, of our best citizens. I do not wish to be misunderstood, for I have no sympathy with the hasty expression that is sometimes heard, that there are no good men in public life. My experience has proved to me that there are just as honest and capable men in municipal positions in the city of Boston to-day as there ever were in the past. The trouble is that there are too many of whom this cannot be said in truth. Our work is to increase the number of those in public life who can be absolutely trusted to watch over the city's interests as they do their own. We want, if possible, to have the same interest taken by all classes of our citizens as is seen across the water. The *personnel* of the London County Council is said to be equal in character and ability to members of Parliament. In the city of Oxford two presidents of colleges are members of the board of aldermen.

In Germany it is demanded that the performance of civic duties shall determine civic rights ; failure to perform the one deprives of the other. In the city of Berlin, if a man refuses to accept office when called upon by his fellow-citizens, he is not only disfranchised, but is compelled to pay larger taxes. Ought there not to be a list made from the registration list after election of those who have not voted ? And ought not a constant neglect of suffrage to be punished by a fine ? Certainly some way must be found to make people ashamed of the neglect of their duty as citizens.

Sixth.—Our duty is not complete when we have tried to induce good men to accept office, and when we have used such influence as we have to elect them. We must have a *constant interest in their work*, ready to encourage if they do well, and not hesitating to hold them to strict account if they prove faithless. There should be a closer touch between the moral interests of our city and those who hold official positions. The mayor of one of our large New England cities has stated that in a term of three years he was never called upon but once by any individual in the interests of righteousness. It would be impossible to compute the number of those who darkened his door for selfish and unworthy schemes. One of the best aldermen our city had for many years, who made a splendid fight on a moral question, when I commended him for it, said that, important as it was, it was almost impossible for him to get any one to take any interest in the matter and give him any moral support. I feel sure that if men in office knew that the best people in the community were interested in municipal matters and ready to be helpful, they would gladly recognize it, and render their very best service. It must be extremely discouraging and depressing to city officials to meet so often only those who have personal and selfish schemes of their own which they are trying to carry through. To all those who are doing their duty, we wish to extend a helping hand. Those that are faithless we must be ready, in a proper and courteous way, to expose. When we are called upon to criticise, we must be careful to make no statement without proof, and also be ready to correct an error if we make one.

Our influence will depend very much upon what we say being fair and unprejudiced.

In order to make our work effective, one of the first duties of the executive committee should be to arrange various sub-committees on municipal business, charter changes, etc., and also consider if the League should not use its influence to establish, in different sections of the city, ward Leagues, which should be represented in the central League by their president or secretary, or by both.

Seventh.—Should not this League devote some thought in the direction of perfecting some sort of *minority representation, with a provision, if possible, for preferential voting?* Many of us believe that the step taken at the last election, which allows minority representation in the board of aldermen, was a step in the right direction; still, that law is very far from perfect, and can be materially improved.

This whole matter is of such supreme importance that it seems proper that we should examine into it most carefully. The principle of having one man or a group of men from each district, which practically disfranchises nearly or quite half the voters, is wrong. When a Republican votes in a Democratic district for local representatives his vote is thrown away, and in the same way, when a Democrat votes in a Republican district his vote is thrown away. To illustrate the injustice of this matter let me use figures which will be familiar. In the State of Maine in the last few years, one party has had about ten thousand more votes than the other, and yet the one party has all the representatives in Congress. In Maryland one party cast ninety-two thousand, and the other one hundred thirteen thousand votes, and the latter have all the representation, and the ninety-two thousand votes have no voice. In Indiana at the last national election one party cast two hundred fifty-four thousand votes, and the other two hundred fifty-nine thousand votes, an almost equal number, and yet one party has but two representatives, and the other eleven. In Iowa it only requires twenty-two thousand men of one party to have a representative, and it requires two hundred

two thousand of the other party in order to have one. It does not answer to say that sometimes it is the one party that is represented, and sometimes the other, and that one is balanced by the other. It is wrong in both cases, and two wrongs never make one right. The same state of things exists in our cities wherever there is a *district system*. As a consequence many men remain away from the caucus and the polls, because they know that their votes would amount to nothing. Furthermore, on the district plan both parties too often nominate the available and not the able men. Men of positive convictions and force make enemies, and cannot be elected; but by a majority representation they can be, for it will not take a majority to elect them.

Again, reform measures cannot get a hearing, for they have no representation, and cannot have until they can secure a majority in some one district. But if all those interested who are scattered through a city, could unite on some one man, then the reform would be represented, and would be sure of a hearing. Giving up the district system as a whole, and voting for officials on a *general ticket*, would be a deathblow to *bribery*, which almost universally occurs in close districts. Were there no close districts, there would be no inducement to purchase votes. On the new plan we should have more of what could be called larger and better men. A man may appear quite important in a little district, but be very small when he has to run the gauntlet of a large city. On such a plan, men in office would not be obliged to spend so much time in posing and balancing their votes so as to make sure of their reelection. In doing their duty they would be sure of the support of the best citizens, whose influence would be felt at the next election.

With this hasty statement of some of the reasons for abolishing the district lines in our cities, even for the common council, if it is to be retained, it may be said that there are four systems of proportional representation which have been practically tested. Of these, the "Free List System," so called, seems to be the best and most easily understood. It is now in use successfully in three cantons in Switzerland. After we have made such success in Massachusetts with the Australian ballot, we

need have no fears about the successful working of this new plan. All candidates are chosen upon a general ticket, and each voter would cast as many votes as there were aldermen or councilmen to be elected, one vote for each. Any individual or ticket which may be indorsed by a petition of voters amounting to some small percentage of the regular vote, shall have the names printed on the official ballot. When the ballots are counted, the total of all the votes cast in the city shall be divided by the total number of the aldermen or council, as the case may be. This quotient gives the quota of representation. Any ticket that receives that number of votes is entitled to one representative; if double the number, two, etc. If there are remainders, the tickets having the largest remainder would have the vacancies. The next question which remains is, which of the candidates on the different tickets or of the different parties, shall have the vote? The answer is simple: The one having the highest number has the first place, and next to the highest the second place. This plan gives the fullest play to the individual preference of every vote cast.

To illustrate this: If there were a single board of aldermen of thirty men, ten to be chosen each year, and a total of five hundred thousand votes cast for all the candidates, every ticket that received fifty thousand votes would be entitled to one alderman. If there were but two tickets, and the Democrats cast three hundred thousand votes and the Republicans two hundred thousand, the former would have six aldermen, and the latter four.

If there was an Independent ticket in the field, and it received fifty thousand votes, the Democrat two hundred seventy thousand, and the Republican one hundred eighty thousand, then the Independent ticket would have one alderman, the Democrat five, and the Republican, inasmuch as it has the largest fraction over the requisite number, four; total, ten. Of course the five Democrats, the four Republicans, and the one Independent, who received the largest number of votes on their representative tickets, would be the ones elected.

In order that this matter may be clearly understood, I give an

illustration which will show the practical working of the plan. I have made three tickets, Democratic, Republican, and Independent, each nominating ten men for the board of aldermen for three years, and who receive the following votes :—

	<i>Democratic.</i>	<i>Republican</i>	<i>Independent.</i>
Mr. A	27,300	K 18,200	U 5,100
B	26,900	L 18,000	V 5,000
C	26,800	M 17,900	W 5,200
D	27,200	N 17,800	X 4,900
E	27,100	O 17,200	Y 4,800
F	27,000	P 18,200	Z 5,050
G	26,700	Q 18,300	AB 4,950
H	26,800	R 18,400	CD 5,150
I	27,150	S 17,950	EF 4,850
J	27,050	T 18,050	GH 5,000
	270,000	180,000	50,000
Total votes, Democratic.....	270,000		
Republican.....	180,000		
Independent.....	50,000		
			500,000

Dividing this total of 500,000 votes by ten, the number of aldermen to be chosen, one tenth, or 50,000, should be represented by one alderman. This number is the *unit of representation*. Dividing the total number of the Democratic votes, 270,000, by 50,000, the unit of representation, you have five as a quotient and 20,000 remainder. In the same way of dividing, the Republicans would have three as a quotient and 30,000 remainder, and the Independents would have one. This provides for nine, and the remaining one goes to the ticket having the *largest fraction*, or remainder, which in this case happens to be the Republican. The board would thus stand five Democrats, four Republicans, one Independent. The five Democrats who would be given the certificates of election would be the five having the largest vote in their list; viz., Messrs. A, D, I, E, J. The four Republicans would be R, Q, T, K. The one Independent would be W.

➤ *Eighth.*—We must not expect to accomplish too much at the outset, else we shall become discouraged, and many will be inclined to give up in despair. We must remember that much time will be required to bring about changes which ought to be

made, and we must be patient, remembering that all important movements require time before they can reach the best results.

> *Ninth.*—We must all keep good-natured with those who honestly differ from us, while we try to show that many things can be improved. We must not care for the politician's criticism, for we do not exist to please him; nor should we pay very much attention to what may be called the chronicle critic. Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes says that "the world can be divided into two classes: Those who go ahead and do something; and, second, those who sit still and find fault because it was not done some other way." Friendly criticism from those who wish to accomplish the same purpose for which we are striving, we should always welcome.

> *Tenth.*—We must never forget the *breadth of our platform*, and that it includes every nationality and sect and creed, and men from every station,—the laboring man, the merchant, the banker, and those in the professions. Men with so many different views will always need to be very generous, one with another, and the common bond must always be that we are Americans and Bostonians, acting without any selfish thoughts, and desiring only to be useful.

> *Finally*, we make no claim for superior wisdom or virtue. We feel that we are citizens together of a city that has had a glorious history, and we hope she is to have a more glorious future. We are united together in an honest effort to study our municipal problems; to help create a right public opinion upon questions as they arise; to foster a civic pride, especially among those who have been indifferent hitherto; to encourage our best citizens to make sacrifices and to accept office as a public trust; to defeat, if we can, the unscrupulous politician who schemes for place and power only that he may serve himself; to encourage faithful officials; to call attention in a courteous manner to incompetency; and, by every means in our power, to render such service toward good government as may seem wise and judicious. *Our method is through agitation and organization.*

SAMUEL B. CAPEN.

A PATRIOTIC PULPIT.

BY REV. F. W. HAMILTON.

IN OUR disgust with the Jefferson Bricks and Elijah Pograms, our natural aversion to some of the cruder forms of "spread-eagleism," and our lack of patience with a vapid conceit, which often mistakes an ignorant self-assurance for a patriotism of the highest and most noble type, we are in some danger of losing sight of the transcendent importance of a really true and sound patriotism. We have become a little ashamed, perhaps, of the persistent and unceasing cry that we are a great nation and must be cracked up, and in our disgust at the pinchbeck article we have, have come to underrate the value of the sterling. We have enough of the pseudo-patriotism which vents itself in jingoism and bluster, in frothy speeches and blare of bands and burning of much gunpowder. But, without assuming at all a pessimistic position, I fear that we have scarcely enough of the true and deep patriotism which recognizes the divinely ordained mission of the Great Republic, honors its grand institutions, reveres the memory of the great men who founded them, and devotes itself with zeal and consecration to the noble work of carrying to completion the unfinished labors of those men, guarding the inviolability of those institutions, and securing the final accomplishment of the nation's mission.

It is not remarkable that there should be some laxness in these regards. The tendencies of the present day are in the direction of cosmopolitanism rather than patriotism everywhere, and nowhere more than here in the United States. Thanks to modern methods of communication and transportation the world is not much bigger to-day than the thirteen colonies were when they declared that they were, and of right ought to be, free and independent States. We are in constant daily communication

with almost every corner of the inhabited earth, and we jostle the children of every nation in our crowded city streets; we have welcomed the world to our broad acres and the invitation has been accepted. There are American lives and American dollars at stake the world over, and the material and pecuniary interests of many of us are more closely bound to the welfare of other countries than to that of our own. The thinkers of the day are talking much about the brotherhood of man and the solidarity of nations. These are great topics, and we do well to bear such ideas in our minds and to let them lie very close to our hearts, but if we are not careful they will lead us to see a certain narrowness in patriotism, and to think that the man who places his country first and foremost in his affections has been left very far behind indeed, by the advance of civilization.

I have already hinted at the importance of patriotism. I think that importance can hardly be overestimated. Certainly without patriotism there can be no safeguards to the liberties of a nation, and no guarantee to the permanency of its institutions. Every student of history knows that patriotism has always been the life blood of nations, and that it, more than any particular institutions, or any model form of government, has made nations powerful and people prosperous and happy. When men have grown cosmopolitan in their ideas, and have cared more for the security of trade than the standing of the nation, and more for the filling of purses than the purity of institutions, nations have fallen and tyranny has flourished. The "unspeakable Turk" came into Europe, not because there was no power on the frontier strong enough to bar him out, but because there was not enough patriotism in Constantinople to place its abundant resources at the disposal of the nation, and so bear up the hands of the last Constantine in his desperate stand against the swelling tide of Moslem invasion.

The growth of the Anglo-Saxon power has been the marvel of the ages. When we stop to think of the tremendous achievements of the people of half a little island, we are dumb with astonishment. We mutely wonder what could have been the cause of it all. Partly the natural virility of the race, partly

the ideas concerning the relation between the individual and the government which seem to form so large a part of its original mental endowment, but most of all, I think, the tremendous patriotism, the firm conviction that everything English was worth defending at any cost, that has always formed the background of the English character. We laugh sometimes at the pretension of our trans-Atlantic cousin, his calm assurance that everything English is best, his arrogant assumption of superiority wherever he goes, his calculations as to how many foreign soldiers or sailors one Englishman may be safely trusted to thrash, and all the other manifestations of British bluster. But, after all, it is just because of these things that the morning drum beat of Great Britain encircles the globe to-day, and her voice is potent, if not omnipotent, in the councils of the nations. The Englishman is the greatest of colonizers because he is so thoroughly convinced of the superiority of everything English to anything else that he never rests till he has made that spot of land where he has built his home a miniature Britain. His institutions are permanent because they are rooted deep in his unswerving loyalty to them and unqualified admiration for them, and they have covered a large part of the earth because he never leaves them at home when he emigrates. Indeed the American Revolution came about because, for the time being, the Englishmen on the American continent were more thoroughly English, more devoted to the perpetuity of English institutions, than were those in the native island. The United States are to-day a monument to the true patriotism of Englishmen.

It has been many times said, and cannot be too often repeated, that governmental institutions are not greatly better than the men who frame and administer them. They do not in their actual working, keep very far ahead of the public opinion on which they ultimately rest. A patriotic people will, in the long run, work out for itself a strong, serviceable, and fairly well administered government. But no institutions, no matter how elaborate, will secure the desired results unless they rest on the willing coöperation of the citizens. Certainly there have been few constitutions more intelligently devised or more carefully

drawn than that of the United States of Brazil, but it took less than six months to demonstrate the fact that it requires something more than a form of sound words to insure good government in a South American Republic. Wherever there is a lust of private gain, or domination of personal or local selfishness, or lack of devotion to the national idea and to high and noble national aims, constitutions are broken, laws are violated and evaded, and ills and abuses without number creep into the body politic. The work fundamental to the success of all good government is the laying of deep and strong foundations of true patriotism in the minds and hearts of the people.

It is not to be denied or ignored that there are ills now assailing the American body politic, and that some of them are assuming formidable proportions. This is not to put the present into any sort of comparison with any past period of our national growth. I do not here raise the question whether we are, as a nation, comparatively more healthy or less healthy than we have been at other times. I simply take note of things as they are. We are beginning to feel keenly the evils of an unrestricted immigration, aggravated as they are by the inducements which interested parties hold out to attract the immigration of the cheapest and least desirable labor. Calling in the services of foreign paupers to strengthen resistance to the demands of native labor, even when those demands are unjust and unreasonable, is an expedient as unwise and as dangerous as that of purchasing by entangling concessions the alliance of a strong neighbor in time of war. We are struggling against the iniquities made possible by an ignorant, a venal, or a suppressed, ballot. We are struggling desperately to throw off the strangling grasp of an iniquity which is draining away our national wealth at the rate of one thousand million a year, is dragging to destruction the flower of our youth, is breaking uncounted and uncountable hearts, is drenching our land in blood and tears, and is daily tightening its hold on the machinery of popular government.

We complain that the diplomacy of the United States is paralyzed by the opposition of the "outs," and that no American minister can go before the world with the assurance that the

country is behind him, or can convince the enemies of the nation that his measures will be endorsed and defended by the whole people.

It is only too true that there is a class of men, who unfortunately have the public eye and ear, who are always ready to prefer party to country, to oppose the diplomacy and the legislation of the other party simply because it is the work of the other party, and to vilify and abuse any man who attains any prominence in the ranks of the opposition. I am fully aware that there is a great deal of criticism, amounting at times almost to abuse, poured out upon politicians as a class. I feel that a great deal of it is entirely unmerited, and is very unwise on the part of those who indulge in it. It is on a par with the silly sayings we sometimes hear about the impossibility of honor among lawyers, almost on a par, indeed, with the ancient mother-in-law jokes of cheap humorists. I doubt if a book has ever been written which has done more to cast discredit upon American institutions and to turn the minds of honest and ambitious young men away from the service of their country than Mark Twain's "Gilded Age." If the book had not fortunately been only a very qualified success commercially, it would be difficult to estimate the harm it might have done. But after all the discounts have been made there is yet a residuum in the politics of the time that is neither sanitary nor savory. We all know that we are suffering as a nation to a considerable extent from the pernicious activity of a class of men whose ideals are low, whose aims are utterly selfish, and whose practices may perhaps be described with sufficient accuracy as demagogish.

Now I have all respect for the brave and earnest men who are addressing themselves to the cure of these evils. I have no word for them except of most cordial sympathy and most hearty encouragement. And yet I cannot help regarding these things as largely symptomatic, as our medical friends would say. It is often not only desirable but necessary to treat the symptoms and remove or alleviate them, but the true security against them lies in restoring the general health to its normal vigor.

Now it seems to me that while these things properly and necessarily challenge our most devoted attention, there is yet much to be done that is fundamental to all national health in the way of the inculcation of a sound and true patriotism, especially in the pliant and susceptible minds of the young. Behind all questions of party or of policy, behind all discussions of measures or of men, should lie a strong and deep and earnest love of country and desire to seek the country's good. In the fostering and strengthening and broadening of such a patriotism lies a vast field for endeavor, a field full of promise of grandest results. Our Master's method of work, the method followed faithfully by his apostles, was to lay deep and strong foundations of eternal and universal truth, and leave the application of them to life and conduct to the awakened and enlightened conscience of the man who had resolved to cease to do evil and learn to do good. In like manner I think we may safely leave a great deal of the detail of reform to the awakened patriotism of the man who loves his country and desires its good rather than any petty personal, local, or partisan advantage. I can easily imagine a man swayed by secondary considerations, by party allegiance, by local pride, even by the most utter and unmitigated selfishness, as doing yeoman service on either side of a great cause, but I cannot imagine a man with the patriotism of a Washington or a Lincoln on the wrong side of any of the questions which now disturb our peace.

It is just in this field that the clergyman has one of his grandest opportunities for usefulness. He has culture and breadth of view, and he has inestimable privileges of access to the public ear and influence over the public mind and heart. His country needs his services. Shall they be withheld? The question comes upon the propriety of clerical service in this cause. I do not think it likely that any person would question the general fairness of the arguments thus far offered for the desirability of a general awakening of the national patriots, but it might and probably would be questioned by many whether the pulpit had any special duty in the premises.

On the broad ground that every effort for the help and im-

provement of men has a right to look for the active coöperation of the Christian men and women of the time, whether clergy or laity, suffering men, suffering society, suffering nations have a right to look to the followers of the Nazarene for aid, and woe to the church if the hungry sheep look up and are not fed! One of the most striking manifestations of the present tendencies of modern religious thought is the emancipation from "other worldliness" which is coming to all religious bodies. The Church of Christ is coming to a realizing sense of the fact that it is something more than fire insurance association, something more than a mutual admiration society, something more than the organized selfishness of men who are interested only in building bridges which shall bear them safely across the flaming mouth of the pit. It is coming back to the idea that salvation is here and now, and that the mission of the gospel is to take away the sins of the world, to save men from this present evil world. It must do these things. It must make itself a vital and energizing force in the world, an essential factor in humanity's progress, or its right to exist will be challenged. Wherever social and political problems stand in the way of advancing humanity it is the duty of organized Christianity, under the direction of its chosen and appointed leaders, to direct the whole of its consecrated zeal and energy to the prayerful, patient, and courageous attempt to solve these problems. The safety of this country and the perpetuity of its magnificent institutions call aloud to heaven to day for pure and high patriotism and more of it. From whom should the call meet response if not from the ministry, the servants of God, and the ambassadors of Christ?

But is not a political pulpit a thing undesirable in the extreme? That depends entirely on the idea covered by the term "political pulpit." If one means a *partisan pulpit*, a pulpit which uses its influence and its advantages of position for the constant advocacy of the interests of any party *as such*, a pulpit which aspires to the exercise of the functions of government, a pulpit which strive to control a certain number of votes as the saloon-keeper or the ward-heeler controls his contingent, it is certainly a most undesirable thing. But if one means a pulpit solicitous to lay its

the hearts of the men and women under its influence broad and deep foundations of patriotism and interest in civic duties, which presents good citizenship as a sacred duty, which never allows its people to forget that the eternal verities of the Christian religion are the keys to political as well as personal salvation, and that the decalogue and the golden rule have not only a place but a dominant place in the most practical kind of politics, such a pulpit is about the most desirable thing that can be named. With the details of the strife of parties, the Christian church and ministry have no business. With what the French call "higher politics" they have most intimate and vital concern. I think I am justified in saying that the church that does not exert an influence in the direction of making its members and hearers better citizens, and so make itself a power for good in the political life of its community, forfeits one of its chief claims to the allegiance and support of the people.

The foundations of the positions here taken seem to me to go down to the very bed rock, so to speak, and to rest in the very nature of institutions. After the lines of this paper had been laid down I had the pleasure of listening to an able, interesting, and profitable public discussion on the general topic, "Church and Politics." It was participated in by gentlemen prominent in the church and by leaders in the affairs of the State. It was inspiring, positive, constructive. Many wise things were said as to the duty of the church to stand for the best things in all the relations of life, the inevitable reaction of private purity on public morals, and the desirability that the church, as an organized body, should refrain from descending into the arena of party politics, even in defense of the best of causes. All was good, and everybody seemed convinced of the fact that the church had, somehow, a political duty to perform.

And yet as I sat there I could not help thinking that the fundamental thought had not been reached, the final word had not been said, the nexus which binds together the Church and the State had not been clearly laid bare. What is a State for? Why are men united into compact bodies under the sway of their own peculiar laws and institutions rather than left to indi-

vidual or family life with no bond other than that of the general brotherhood upon which we are now laying so much stress? Let St. Paul offer his answer to these questions: "God . . . hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if happily they might feel after Him, and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us." The State, then, is a divinely ordained institution as much as the Church is. It is one of the means whereby men are to be helped to find God. By their association together, by the crystallization of the best and most enlightened public opinion in that great educator, law; by the power placed in the hands of good and strong men, the natural leaders of the race, and the greater currency and effect given to their opinions; most of all by the founding of national life on principles of righteousness and of progress, and the development of the national life and thought along the lines dictated by those principles, men are helped immeasurably in their efforts toward the attainment of higher standards of living, and the progress of truth and enlightenment is vastly accelerated. Every nation this world has ever seen has existed because God had something for it to do and some message for it to deliver. The Jewish nation, considered with reference to its national life and national idea, its "motive," as the musician would term it, was as much a prophet of God, a heaven-sent teacher of the nations, as were the Isaiahs and Jeremiahs and Ezekiels who came to marshal it along its appointed way. This nation exists by virtue of its mission. God made it that it might teach and exemplify certain truths which the nations aforetime knew not. It exists by virtue of its institutions, those fundamental ideas which we term, collectively, Americanism. This nation being founded and its institutions being framed by God for the accomplishment of His own high purposes in the development of the human race and the bringing of it into closer knowledge of himself and touch with his spirit, can there be any doubt as to the duty of those who minister at His altars and try to interpret Him to their fellows, to address

themselves with all their strength to the furtherance of His plans by leaving no means untried to keep warm and fresh in the hearts of the people the love of those institutions, the determination that they shall be kept inviolate, and the eager desire to realize their utmost possible development? It seems to me that a true comprehension of the nature and purpose of a State shows that it is bound by indissoluble bonds to the Church, and that, while neither should control the other or meddle with the detail of the other's affairs, it is a fundamental duty of the State to be religious, and of the Church to be patriotic. As long as there continues to be a need of patriotism the duty of cultivating and inculcating it must lie upon the Church, and here, as elsewhere, the pulpit must lead.

The methods by which these things may be accomplished will suggest themselves to each individual. I am aware of the extreme danger of attempting to speak *ex cathedra* as to methods in any kind of work. Methods must be determined by the tact and judgment of the individual backed by sincere devotion to the proposed end. "Where there is a will there is a way," and if we want to do this thing we shall easily find out how to do it. We have already many opportunities offered by the general turning of the public mind toward patriotic themes on the national holidays. Let us never fail to make proper use of Washington's Birthday and Decoration Day, of Fourth of July and Thanksgiving, of our New England Forefathers' Day, and other days of more local observance. We have countless opportunities for showing the application of Christian truth to the organized life of the nation and the Christian foundation of American institutions without dragging such topics in where they are not pertinent. We have an incalculable influence over the minds and hearts of the thousands of children who gather Sunday after Sunday in our Sunday-schools. We have the opportunity to form classes for the study of American history, American institutions, and the general principles of civil government among our young people. We have countless opportunities, grand ones too, for doing our part in the creation of an atmosphere of pure and high and devoted patriotism, an atmosphere in which political cor-

ruption and all its spawn of abuses and iniquities will wither and shrivel as the cavern-fungus is scorched by the hot, strong sunshine of a summer noon.

Brethren, clerical and lay, our country needs our help ; shall it call to us in vain ? If we will arouse ourselves and work together in this matter, it is possible to make every Sunday-school a nursery of patriots, every church a tower of strength for pure and devoted citizenship, and every pulpit a pillar of fire leading God's people along the way to the full accomplishment of their divinely ordained mission. It is for such a church and such a pulpit that I make my plea.

F. W. HAMILTON.

CHRISTIANITY IN OUR NATIONAL LIFE.

BY REV. B. W. WILLIAMS.

THE separation of Church and State is a doctrine dear to every patriotic American heart. This, however, does not signify that we, as a nation, are hostile or indifferent to the Christian religion. On the contrary, we recognize it as one of the most potent factors in our civilization and progress. It is chiefly to Christian believers that we are indebted for the founding, development, and preservation of our free republican government.

This country was originally settled by Christian believers. The desire to plant Christian colonies, and to establish a Christian commonwealth, was one of the principal motives which prompted our forefathers to emigrate to America. The various colonies were founded by the different religious denominations. In New York, the Dutch Reformed Church predominated. In Virginia, the Church of England was established. Pennsylvania, Delaware, and West Jersey were settled by the Quakers; Massachusetts, by the Puritans; Maryland, by the Catholics; other colonies, by the various Protestant sects. Bancroft says: "The colonists, including their philosophy in their religion, as the people up to that time had always done, were neither skeptics nor sensualists, but Christians. The school that bows to the senses as the sole interpreter of truth had little share in colonizing our America. The colonists from Maine to Carolina, the adventurous companions of Smith, the proscribed Puritans that freighted the fleet of Winthrop, the Quaker outlaws that fled from jails with a Newgate prisoner as their sovereign,—all had faith in God and in the soul. . . . Our fathers were not only Christians, they were, even in Maryland by a vast majority, elsewhere almost unanimously, Protestants." *

* "History U. S. Centenary Edition, Vol. II, p. 177."

The Declaration of Independence was chiefly the work of men who revered Christianity and the Bible. This is made clear from several facts.

1. It appears that the first man who openly and publicly declared in favor of a total separation from Great Britain was Samuel Adams, of Massachusetts. This was about the year 1768.* He "originated the idea of a Colonial Congress in 1765, and was the earliest advocate of a Continental Congress in 1774."† These measures did much to prepare the way for independence. At the time the Declaration was made in 1776, "no one man had done so much to bring about independence as the elder Adams."‡ We are told that "he was a sincere and practical Christian; and the last production of his pen was in favor of Christian truth."||

2. The first formal declaration of independence ever issued by a public assembly in America was made by a company of Scotch Irish Presbyterians, at Charlotte, Mecklenberg county, North Carolina, in May, 1775.§ This is known as the Mecklenberg Declaration. True, it was local in its character, and formed only a kind of prelude to the final Declaration of Independence by Congress, in July, 1776; but it shows that the prime movers in the struggle for liberty were Christians.

3. It will be remembered that the resolution in Congress, which declared "that these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States," was offered by Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia.¶ "He was a professed believer in the Christian religion; and this avowal of his faith was made amid the accumulated honors of the world, which were lavishly bestowed on him, with sincere good will, and in the full unclouded exercise of his vigorous mind".**

4. The committee appointed by Congress to draft the Declaration of Independence was composed of men who revered the Christian religion. That committee consisted of Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, and Robert R. Livingston.†† The last mentioned, however, was called

* Bancroft, Vol. IV., p. 109. † Lossing's "Eminent Americans", p. 79. ‡ Bancroft, Vol. V., pp. 269-70. § "One Hundred Years of a Nation's Life", p. 15. ¶ Bancroft, Vol. IV., pp. 577-79. || Bancroft, Vol. V., p. 267. ** Dwight's "Lives of the Signers", p. 28. †† Bancroft, Vol. V., p. 269.

to his duties at home before the final vote was taken, so that his name does not appear as one of the signers to that instrument.

Mr. Jefferson has often been put down as an infidel; but a closer examination of his character reveals the fact that he was far from being a scoffer at religion. In 1803 he wrote a letter to Dr. Rush in which he said: "To the corruptions of Christianity I am indeed opposed; but not to the genuine precepts of Jesus himself. *I am a Christian* in the only sense in which he wished anyone to be; sincerely attached to his doctrines, in preference to all others."* He was a frequent and liberal contributor to religious enterprises. He attended the Episcopal church regularly, and participated in the services. His children were baptized in that church. His wife belonged to it. He was buried according to its rites.†

John Adams was a man of fervent and sincere piety, and for sixty years a member of the church.‡

Dr. Franklin had been tinctured with skepticism in his youth, but his practical good sense soon led him to abandon such views, and according to the testimony of his biographers, he became, in maturer years, a believer in divine revelation.|| He called himself a "Protestant of the Church of England, holding in the highest veneration the doctrines of Jesus Christ."§

Roger Sherman was an humble, faithful, and devoted Christian. "Before he had attained the age of twenty-one years, he made a public profession of his religion, and continued more than half a century a zealous defender of its doctrines."¶

5. It appears from a careful study of American history and biography that the signers to the Declaration of Independence, with scarcely an exception, were men of deep religious convictions—firm believers in Christianity and the Bible. If there was a scoffer at religion among the entire number, we have been unable to find any record of it in history. They were men who

* Works, Vol. IV., p. 479.

† See Randall's "Life of Jefferson," Vol. III., Chap. 14.

‡ Sanderson's "Biography of the Signers", pp. 120-30.

§ See Lossing's "Eminent Americans," p. 40; Sanderson's "Biography of the Signers," p. 402, and "One Hundred Years of a Nation's Life," pp. 42, 43.

¶ Parton's "Life of Franklin," Vol. I., p. 557.

§ Sanderson's "Biography of the Signers," p. 222.

"owned the restraints of religion."* When they signed the Declaration of Independence, "it was accompanied with prayer to Almighty God."† They explicitly recognized, in that immortal document, the existence of God as our Creator. They spoke of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as being derived from Him. They asserted the Christian idea of the equality of all men. They appealed to God, as the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, for the rectitude of their intentions. How, I ask, could these facts be explained on the hypothesis that our forefathers were hostile or indifferent to the Christian religion?

The Revolutionary War, by which our independence was established, was carried on and successfully terminated chiefly by Christian believers. The soldiers and patriots of the Revolution were very generally men who accepted, with devout reverence, the Christian religion. An atheist in the American army would have been regarded as a kind of moral monstrosity. The generals who led our armies were, with scarcely an exception, devout, pious, prayerful men. This is especially true in regard to Washington, Putnam, Green, Warren, Prescott, Morgan, Wayne, Knox, and Lincoln. Those foreign noblemen who came to America to assist in the struggle for liberty, DeKalb, Steuben, Lafayette, Pulaski, and Kosciusko, were also Christian believers. Benedict Arnold, who betrayed his country and went over to the enemy, did not acknowledge the restraints of religion. Charles Lee was an infidel, but he turned out badly, and was dismissed from the army in disgrace.

The adoption of the Federal Constitution and the formation of the government under it was principally the work of Christian statesmen. "Many of the authors of the Constitution were themselves men of strong religious convictions."‡ Some people imagine that the Constitution of the United States is an infidel document, because it prohibits Congress from making any law respecting the establishment of religion. This provision, however, did not result from indifference or hostility toward

* Sanderson's "Biography," p. 21. † Abbott's "Lives of the Presidents," p. 100.
‡ Townsend's "Analysis of Civil Government," p. 225.

Christianity, but from a desire to prevent the establishment of a national church. Judge Story says : " We are not to attribute this prohibition of a national religious establishment to an indifference to religion in general, and especially to Christianity, *which none could hold in more reverence than the framers of the Constitution*, but to a dread by the people of the influence of ecclesiastical power in matters of government." * We may be reminded, just here, that the Constitutional Convention declined to have its sessions opened with prayer. Yes ; but Lossing says it was because " there was no money which could be appropriated for the payment of a minister of the gospel for the sacred service." †

The preservation, development, and progress of our government are chiefly due to the labors of Christian statesmen. The men who have been chiefly instrumental in defending, strengthening, and perpetuating our free institutions, and in giving stability, honor, and greatness to our nation, have not been infidels, but believers in Christianity and the Bible. This is notably true of such men as Hamilton, Madison, Jay, the Adamses, Kent, Story, Webster, Clay, Jackson, Lincoln, and a host of others. They feared God. They revered the Bible. They believed in Christ. What would our country have been to-day without their services? How small would be the volume of American history were their achievements eliminated from its annals. Abbott truly says : " The presidents of our colleges, the most prominent men at the bar, the most distinguished of our statesmen, our ablest scientific men, our most heroic generals, are men who revere Christianity ; who seek its guidance through life, and its support in death." ‡ Christianity is the parent of our great republic. It sustained our forefathers in the struggle for independence. It taught their descendants to be free and happy. It has been the foundation and source of our national greatness and prosperity.

B. W. WILLIAMS.

* " Exposition of the Constitution," p. 259.

† Outline " History of the United States," p. 231.

‡ History of Christianity, pp. 300-1.

A NEW IRELAND IN AMERICA: A REPLY TO LORD SALISBURY.*

BY THOMAS BURKE GRANT.

THERE has been so much said and written on the subject of Home Rule for Ireland during the quarter of a century that has elapsed since February, 1870, when at a meeting mainly composed of Irish Protestants, the movement was first launched, that all the arguments for or against the measure were considered exhausted. Nothing distinctly new was expected from any quarter. People generally had made up their minds on the Irish question, after the numerous speeches, essays, or parliamentary discussions incidental to the two Home Rule bills respectively proposed by Mr. Gladstone in 1886 and in 1892. They were ready to permit the movement to work out its own destiny in the whirligig of English politics. Even in England, so completely had the field of controversy been occupied that the present Irish secretary, upon reading the latest arguments at the Ulster Convention, where the Duke of Abercorn and his friends declared that "Ulster would fight," dropped the newspaper containing them, out of his hand, with the remark that it was merely a "threshing over of old straw." "There is nothing new in these statements" remarked he, and recalling the couplet,

* [NOTE—This article has been compiled by the authority of the Irish National Federation of America, with branches in every state of the Union, and which have subscribed a sum of \$87,000 to the McCarthy wing of the Irish Home Rule party. The materials have been supplied by three hundred of the leading Irishmen in business or professional circles in twenty-six states of the Union, including Hon. William McAdoo, ex-member of Congress, now assistant secretary of United States navy, Hon. W. Bourke Cochran, Dr. Thomas Addis Emmet, and others. It is the first notable expression of any authoritative body as to the terms upon which the Irish of America would make peace with England, and is intended as a reply to the objections of that section of anti-home rulers, of whom the Marquis of Salisbury and Prof. Goldwin Smith are the most notable examples, who state that the Irish people would be at the mercy of American agitators, who are in turn the most permanent and implacable enemies of imperial institutions and of British commerce.]

"Such labored nothings in so strange a style,
Amuse the unlearned, and make the learned smile."

Mr. Morley proceeded with the other business of his office which, just then, was to hear reports on the peaceful condition of the people through the various county grand juries in the other provinces of Ireland.

It remained, however, for Lord Salisbury to discover a new and somewhat cogent argument to his mind against Mr. Gladstone's measure, and to infuse an interest into the discussion which almost transfers the question from the people on the banks of the Thames to those who reside on the Hudson or on the shores of Lake Michigan. In his speech delivered at Trowbridge and reported at length in the *Times* of May 4. The ex-premier enthused his audience to a high pitch of excitement, speaking as follows :

Lord Rosebery has another ground for Home Rule for Ireland which is still more remarkable. He speaks to us of the population of America. He tells us that we are offending the Irish element there. He says, "You have an enemy and a nest of enemies in every English-speaking state"—there is only one English-speaking state (laughter)—"and this great and cosmopolitan evil not only affects your foreign relations, but disturbs your empire itself." Are we really to give up our Ulster brethren to this slavery in order to please the triangle at Chicago or the bosses of Tammany at New York? (Laughter.) Are we to sink so low as that? To my mind the ground that he alleges is rather a reason for resisting Home Rule than for granting it. (Hear, hear.) These men to whom he appeals and whose friendship he is anxious to secure are the most bitter, the most unscrupulous, the most permanent enemies of all that is British that can be found in America. (Cheers.) They are the anti-British party, and there is no libel, no slander that is strange to their tongue and to their pen when they have to speak of British things and British institutions. We have many friends in America. I am proud to believe that our friends are in the large majority, and I hope that that friendship will always continue. (Hear, hear.) I believe that if they would venture for electoral reasons to speak their minds they would designate the Irish minority with whom they have to struggle in language far more vigorous than I should venture to assume. (Cheers.) It is their great trial and trouble. But I am accustomed to think that we settle our international institutions without reference to the care or the wishes of any foreign class or power. (Loud cheers.) But if any class is to be conciliated I would rather conciliate the class that loves us in America and not the class that pursues us with an undying hate. (Renewed cheers.) And if this

is the object of giving independence, practical independence, to Ireland—what will the result be? Why, that the Irish, the anti-British classes in America, will be dominant in Ireland too, and you will have within four hours of your coasts, in command of your trade routes, threatening all your ports—you will have all Ireland under the domination of men who have shown their antipathy, their enthusiasm in hatred of England, in terms and in actions which do not permit you to doubt for a moment either its sincerity or its permanence. (Hear, hear.) Are you going, for causes such as these, to hand over a neighboring island which occupies an important strategic position to your bitterest foes? Are you going for causes such as these to hand over your brethren of Ulster, to whom you are united by every tie, to a tyranny which they do not cease to dread and to denounce, and which they will resist by every means in their power? I do not so read the duty of England. I agree with Lord Rosebery that you are the predominant partner. (Cheers.)

The usually formidable bill of indictment which English Tories present against Irish Home Rule is here supplemented in at least three important respects. First, it is asserted that Mr. Gladstone's bill would truckle to the Hessian element in American politics, whom, being also a foreign element, from the English standpoint, it would be useless to conciliate; second, that those American citizens of Irish birth whose energy has been devoted to, or whose money has been invested in, the cause of Irish freedom are as cordially despised by other Americans who are not of Irish lineage, as the Irish-Americans are by the British Tories themselves, and consequently these are other people whom England ought to conciliate; and third, that the granting of Home Rule would enable Irish-Americans who are still supposed to hate England to use Ireland as a lever with which to work out a retributive policy against the British Empire at its very gates. It will be at once seen that the third proposition of Lord Salisbury, if true, is exceedingly important, and would involve great national danger, because without American aid there would be no Home Rule movement. It has therefore been deemed advisable to meet this charge full in the face, and with that view a circular letter has been addressed by me to 300 leading Irish-Americans in the principal cities of the United States with the consent and approval of the Irish National Federation of America. In this circular a list of

questions covering all the points commonly raised on Tory platforms was enclosed, together with an extract from Lord Salisbury's speech as cabled to America and published in the *New York Sun*.

Their responses received up to date, together with the circular in question, are given herewith, and speak for themselves. But before proceeding to consider these responses, which represent, in a large measure, the voice of Irish America, and coming as they do from men who would presumably control the deliberations of an Irish-American convention, they are worthy of careful study, both in this country and in England. Public conventions are often manipulated by leading men, and made to produce results predicted by their managers in advance. They are frequently, also, the scenes of excitement and of heated discussion, where the reason is subjected to the will, and where the heart predominates, and not the head. These responses, written out by each of those to whom they were sent, after calm reflection, and vouched for by their signatures, are far more authoritative in their nature than even the resolutions of an Irish national convention, which, at most, would represent the combined intelligence of a committee on resolutions, consisting of three or five men. They furnish an inside view of Irish-American opinion, and throw an interesting side light from the shores of America on the whole Irish question. They also unmistakably prove that those English Tories who have heretofore pictured Irish-Americans as a band of desperadoes in active antagonism to the British Empire, and infused by an unchristian, an uncivilized, and an undying hate against England and Englishmen, are very much mistaken in their estimate of Irish-American good sense and character. These responses, I submit obtained in the way already described, without any attempt to influence the judgment, show that passion has been superseded by cold intelligence, prejudice by liberality of opinion, sentiment by practical good sense; and that as there has grown up in America, within the past thirty years, a new South, so there also looms into view, probably for the first time, in all its striking and refreshing significance, a new Ireland.

But before proceeding to consider the more important question involved in this list of queries, let us take the propositions of Lord Salisbury in the order in which they occur in his Trowbridge speech, and which concern not so much the relations of the Irish in America to the British Empire, as their attitude to the American people themselves, and the feelings of Americans toward them. Let us, then, take up the allusion to the Hessian element in American politics, and for the purpose of defining it, let it be understood as embracing all those Irishmen in America who follow in the fortunes of Tammany Hall; who are starting anti-British leagues, who are constantly talking war, or who, from one motive or another, are seeking to keep the Irish in America under the rule of clan leaders, exploiting their innate patriotism, or exhibiting them in a false light to the rest of the world. Then, first, as to Tammany Hall, an institution which Lord Salisbury associates with the Chicago Triangle, and casts both like a burning torch into the faces of Irish Home Rulers, and incidentally into those of their friends among the English people. Tammany Hall, though at present largely dominated by professional Irishmen, is not an Irish organization in any sense. It couldn't exist in Ireland for a single year, and no organization similar in character to Tammany Hall, has ever existed in Ireland. Nor has any such organization existed in those large cities in England and Scotland, where men of Irish birth or lineage constitute as large a proportion of the population as they do in New York or in Chicago. Tammany Hall, or, to give its generic name, the Columbian Order, is purely an American institution, duplicated in no other city or country in the world. Its existence is only possible in countries whose people are insensible to the aspirations of a sound patriotism and utterly indifferent to the public welfare. It is simply an American corporation which adapts to politics the principles of the trusts in the case of trade, and which, after the accumulated experience of a century, can corrupt the ermine of the bench without a blush for shame, practice robbery as a public profession, and reduce tyranny to a fine art. The Irish people repudiate Tammany Hall. They repudiate the allegation so frequently made on English

Tory platforms, that if the Irish obtained Home Rule they would establish a branch of the Columbian Order on College Green. In a country of such political activity as Ireland, such a thing would be impossible, and the assumption that Tammany would be reproduced in Dublin, does the Irish people a cruel and an outrageous wrong.

Of the Chicago Triangle little may be said, further than that while the ranks of Irish revolutionists in America contain many decent and self-respecting men, men actuated by high and lofty ideals, sweet in their domestic environments, and loyal citizens of any country to which they would pledge allegiance, such men do not recognize the Triangle to-day in America.

They are even more opposed to the Triangle than to the continuation of English rule in Ireland. They even regard it as a public enemy, cunning, sly, insidious, and slow. What Horace Greeley said of the Democrats not being all horse thieves, while every horse thief was certain to be a Democrat, is equally applicable to the Triangle; while every Triangler in America is sure to be a revolutionist, every revolutionist is by no means a Triangler. It is obviously as unreasonable, therefore, for Lord Salisbury to taunt Irishmen with the Triangle as to point to a wart or a birthmark on a man's face as proof of ignoble origin or a hereditary stain in his blood. The chief functions of the Triangle, in recent years, seem to be to empty the war-chest of the Irish in America for the English government, or to enable Lord Salisbury and the Tory party to call the Triangle up occasionally from its dark closet, in order to frighten Englishmen on the eve of general election, in much the same way as a nurse-maid calls up the bogey man to put troublesome children to sleep.

This is about the way in which the Chicago Triangle enters into the life and feelings of the Irish in America. Occasionally they awaken us in this country to a realization of their existence, by the murder of an American citizen, like Dr. Cronin, by exploding a firecracker or two on London Bridge, or by publishing some hare-brained resolutions in the American press, for consumption among the credulous people of distant Britain. To illustrate more fully, if further illustration be needed, how the

Triangle lives, I may relate an incident which was of common occurrence in the days when coercion was rife in Ireland, and when Mr. Gladstone and the Tory opposition were metaphorically pelting a certain Irish editor across the floor of the House of Commons, at each other's heads. As he left his office he was handed a copy of an evening paper containing a London dispatch, showing that he had been much in evidence during a certain parliamentary debate that day, at Westminster. He promptly returned to his printing office and, showing the paper to his manager, chuckled to himself, as he remarked: "Prepare a new circular on the Irish question! that debate is at least worth two thousand subscribers." So it is with the Triangle. Each time it is mentioned in England, by a statesman of the rank of Lord Salisbury or by an ultra-Conservative publication of the character of the *St. James Gazette*, the "brothers" turn the allusion into hard cash, urge renewed efforts in behalf of physical force, and that same evening or next day are pretty certain to visit the corner groggery and tell how "these Saxons are afraid of us." The Triangle in America, and the Tory party in England, seem to be thus essential to each other's existence. It is well known to all thoughtful people, that they play into each other's hands. Like a pair of beveled wheels, while seemingly running at different angles, they actually drive each other along and maintain a constant and reciprocal motion. The Trianglers in Chicago point to Lord Salisbury's remarks as proof of Saxon hate, and Lord Salisbury, in return, points his finger over the Atlantic to the Triangle in order to rally his followers in behalf of the grand old cause of privilege and of class misrule. I invite Lord Salisbury to contemplate himself in this connection, in the hope that the simile of the grasshoppers and the fat oxen may not be wholly lost upon his imagination, and beg to let both Tammany Hall and the Chicago Triangle go at that.

In respect to the second proposition, viz.: That America are his party friends and are afraid to express their real sentiments, and if they could do so, would speak of Irishmen in terms of even less civility than he would himself presume to use, the examination of the statement implies its obvious absurd

and carries with it its own refutation. In the form in which Lord Salisbury makes the statement, it will doubtless amuse many people in America; and those whose risibilities fail to respond to the humorous character of the allusion, will at once ask, was Lord Salisbury serious, or what kind of Americans has his lordship met at the tea tables of Mayfair, anyway?

It is a trifle absurd to find an English statesman of the strong common sense and penetrating judgment of the ex-premier, assume there is any considerable section of Americans who regard the Irish as other than a friendly people or who would refuse them a reasonable measure of native government. Americans meet Irishmen in all walks of life. They live together in peace and form one common people. The Irishman realizes what his race and country owe to America and the American what his race and country owe to Ireland and to Irishmen in return. They mutually respect and esteem each other, and though the drift of the Irishmen has been less manifest in the field of commerce than in that of politics and the professions, they have no antagonistic relations and are united in the bonds of a common citizenship. It may be true that some Americans, probably recent arrivals in England who have discarded their American citizenship and abandoned the people and the country where their fortunes were accumulated, have been excluded from senatorial or congressional honors by the incisive activity of the Irish and, that they or such as they, have unconsciously deceived themselves or minimized the influence of the Irish in America when talking with Lord Salisbury. But this inconsiderable class, who stand to America in much the same light as absentee lords have stood to Ireland, do not represent American feeling or opinion. In fact, they are not as good Americans as the average Irishman, who numbers together with his descendants about twelve millions. It is entirely at variance with probabilities, and utterly illogical in fact, for even Lord Salisbury to state that fifty odd millions are dominated by the personalities of twelve millions or are in any sense held in subjection by them. American principles and American institutions form the keystone and the centre-board of the whole superstructure of

American life, and all foreign nationalities acquire influence just in proportion as they conform to the model set before them by the constitution. This is as true of the Irishman as it is of the Bohemian or the Italian or the Hungarian nationalities. The ignorance, therefore, if I may be allowed to use the word without disrespect, which Lord Salisbury shows of America is second only to the gross obstinacy which his party has maintained in all its relations with the Irish people. When I lived in Ireland it was quite common to have some tourist of note, or a magazine writer chock full of learned reflections upon theories of government, and probably just emerging from college, cross the Irish Channel, put up at a hotel in Dublin or Killarney, visit the Vale of Avoca, or spend a pleasant day with the Earl of Meath, with Viscount Powercourt, or with Lords Plunkett or Monck, and then go back to England to spin out stories by the yard of the peasantry, or nostrums for the solution of the Irish difficulty. These gentlemen drove around in an Irish jaunting-car and viewed the cabins of the people through a monocle or an opera glass. Their lucubrations when they returned to England afforded the Irish people immense amusement and the philosophical remedies proposed for Irish wrongs by these Britishers used to be a topic of conversation for months afterwards. I think in the same way the view thrown on Americans in their relations with Irishmen from the English Tory stereopticon must be for us subjects of infinite jest. Nothing, I think, has been said so strikingly grotesque as this statement of Lord Salisbury's by a public man since Matthew Arnold made a tour of this country in 1887. Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule bill of 1886 was then a subject of conversation at American dinner tables. But even Matthew Arnold failed to understand the drift of American opinion while on the spot, and the extent of his researches may be imagined when he states that when he returned to England Mr. Arnold said he met no man of culture in America who was a Home Ruler, except our good friend, Mr. E. L. Godkin of the *Evening Post*; but he naïvely added the eminent litterateur, "Mr. Godkin is an Irishman." Of course he is, and a very excellent Irishman too,

Mr. Godkin was by no means the only gentleman of culture whom Matthew Arnold discovered in America during his search for Home Rulers. Apropos of Mr. Arnold's visit and of the inability of Englishmen to grasp the situation or adapt themselves to the surroundings in which they may be placed, I may mention an incident of Mr. Arnold's visit in 1887 that is not recorded in his published notes. He probably, like Carlyle, was in too cynical a mood to remember it. One of the places where Matthew Arnold was entertained on that occasion was at the house of the late Mrs. Astor, and among those invited to meet the distinguished Englishman was a prominent Irish-American lawyer. After dinner Matthew Arnold spoke rather freely, and in words of reflection, of Irishmen in connection with their subserviency to the prelates of the Catholic church, as being an avowed materialist, he probably would also have spoken of laymen in relation to the prelates of any other church.

"Oh, Mr. Arnold," remarked Mrs. Astor, a little shocked by the remark, but yet sweet in tone, "please don't say that, Judge —— is a Catholic."

"Is it possible that you are a Papist?" remarked Mr. Arnold, somewhat astonished, as he turned to Judge ——."

"We do not usually call Catholics by that name in this country," rejoined Judge —— with quiet dignity, now feeling that the guest had quite forgotten himself, "but if you will so designate them, then I am a Papist."

The conversation was changed and Matthew Arnold left, without learning, as he otherwise might, much about Irishmen in America that might be of use in England in aiding his party to grasp the nature and the necessities of Home Rule. Now, this incident indicates the superficial way in which even leading Englishmen will persist in dealing with Irishmen, whether they meet them at the dinner tables of Mayfair or of Fifth Avenue, and while the Irishman, whether in Ireland or America, has his own quarrels—and sometimes bitter ones, too—with the prelates of the Catholic church for their interference in secular affairs, his whole nature and all the traditions of his soul will recoil with indignation at a coarse remark such as Mr. Arnold's.

It is thus that Irishmen and Englishmen are frequently kept asunder and fail to learn enough of each other to justify an interchange of knowledge or sentiments of mutual appreciation. Men like Lord Salisbury and Matthew Arnold do not understand Irishmen, and Irishmen do not understand them; and if there is one thing more essential than another to settle up the differences of centuries, it is that each in an age of ideas and of common sense should now understand the other.

But to return to Lord Salisbury's argument. Is his lordship not a little illogical when he speaks of conciliating Americans, who, he assures us, rather frankly, love Englishmen better than they do Irish-Americans who live among them and with whom they are brought into contact each day of their lives? Surely if the bond of love is so closely drawn as Lord Salisbury represents, it isn't necessary to "conciliate" Americans. Lord Salisbury asks, why should we conciliate our enemies? The great statesman, to whom Lord Salisbury served his apprenticeship in politics (Lord Beaconsfield), would have answered his question by the diplomatic motto of his life—"Treat your enemies as if they might one day become your friends." Lord Salisbury, in his brusque and characteristically sweeping manner, would, for the sake of snatching a temporary party advantage at the next general election, fain make the doctrine of hate a permanent article of the Tory creed. He would reverse the maxim of the greatest leader of British Toryism within the century. It is not possible to think that Lord Salisbury desires to make permanent the hatred which his words deprecate, and yet the loose nature of the language used is capable of no other construction.

Again, might it not have occurred to Lord Salisbury that fifty millions of Americans are held in thralldom by twelve millions of Irishmen, that it would be more politic to conciliate those with power than those without power, and who couldn't, according to himself, venture to speak their honest minds if they had any? The question implies an absurdity, but it is also, whether intentional or not, most uncomplimentary to those Americans whom Lord Salisbury calls his friends. It would give grave offense to Americans if they were not aware that this reckless

manner of speaking is characteristic of Lord Salisbury. It is one of the proud privileges of a Cecil to affect to despise the people. The failing seems to be ingrained in that branch of the Cecil family of which Lord Salisbury is the acknowledged head. Three centuries ago, the founder of the house of Salisbury, in speaking of Englishmen, told James I. that he "would need neither bit nor bridle to govern them, but their asses' ears." The Salisbury of that day did not intend offense to Englishmen; it was a way he had of speaking his mind, and probably the Salisbury of to-day, who used to turn his back upon the wool-sack and upon Earl Granville, as the leader of Her Majesty's opposition, doesn't mean to offend Americans, or Irishmen; like his famous ancestor, who was alternately called "Spider" Cecil, and "Robert, the Devil," because of his faculty for weaving plots or webs around men honestest than himself, it is a way he has of speaking his mind, and comes to him naturally, like his title—by right of descent.

In connection with Lord Salisbury's attack upon Irish-Americans which was submitted to the Hon. William McAdoo, Assistant Secretary of the United States Navy, I have been favored with a letter from which the following is extracted :

The statements made by Lord Salisbury show great ignorance of the status and character of the citizenship of the republic that is Irish by birth or extraction. It would be positively ridiculous for any one who understands the situation in the United States, and who is cognizant of the plain facts regarding Irish-Americans here to undertake the serious reply to the arguments advanced by Lord Salisbury. Of course, it is quite true that among the millions of those of Irish antecedents who are mingled in the active pursuits of the public and private life of the masses of the people who go to make up our population, there are occasionally, but rarely, those who are unworthy and unfaithful; but, taken as a whole, I venture to assert that the Irish-Americans will be acknowledged by all impartial judges to be, at the very least, equal in patriotism, intelligence, industry, and devotion to the republic, to any other people who go to make up the sum of our common citizenship. Indeed, taking the whole history of the United States from the beginning until the present moment, they need no vindication whatever, and, therefore, with Americans generally, Lord Salisbury will certainly have injured his case.

The Irish-Americans, far from being what Lord Salisbury charges, are, I think, unquestionably among the most conservative elements in

this country. As regards life and property, and a strict regard for law and order, they may challenge comparison with any other people here.

To select an occasional wrong doer with an Irish name, in New York or Chicago, and indict for his offense a whole race is what Lord Salisbury attempts. Opposed to this he ignores the great galaxy of illustrious names interwoven in the whole history of the United States, and which illumine the annals of our country in every field.

For an unfaithful municipal officer we bring forward thousands of faithful and able men in every office and in all pursuits. If the Irish race had no other history than that it has made in America it might well be proud. Soldiers, heroes, tribunes, judges, sages, philosophers, merchants, bankers, manufacturers, pioneers, poets, prophets, and priests, they pass in imperial procession to confute Lord Salisbury and his fellows.

In what I say here I am not expressing any of my own views on the situation in Ireland, from a purely Irish standpoint. I am endeavoring to simply and briefly answer your questions with reference to Lord Salisbury's late speech. I might, if it were proper for me to discuss it, point out more extensively wherein, in my judgment, Lord Salisbury is a very dangerous leader for the English people, so far as the Irish question is concerned."

We now come to the third and most important question raised by Lord Salisbury's speech: Do Irish-Americans hate England, and would they encourage their kinsmen in Ireland through the same agencies which made Home Rule possible to use the concession as a stamping ground against British commerce? It would be impossible for any single person to answer that question. But as already stated in the preface to this article, the opinions of three hundred of leading men who have participated in Irish movements in the past, who still represent Irish organizations, and whose voice may, under certain contingencies, still be quoted in the future, have been solicited to reply to Lord Salisbury.

Here are the questions, with sample answers of the various Irishmen, many of whom have devoted time and money to the work of Irish revolution. Several replies, it is right to say, were received from people in the western states, who didn't state their names, others wrote with pencil, but all replies received without exception, were similar in character to those answers herewith appended. Five answers, selected from the correspondence, are given with each question.

Question 1.—"Is it true that Irish-Americans, to gratify feelings of revenge for past misgovernment, would now frustrate a measure of Home Rule, and use that concession as a vantage ground from which to assail the commerce of Great Britain?"

Answers.—"It is not true. Irish-Americans are anxious for a settlement of the Irish question, and for an opportunity for the people of Ireland to live in peace with, and participate in, the general commercial prosperity of the people of England and Scotland."

Another says: "Irish-Americans are aiding Ireland to secure Home Rule for the sole purpose of having them relieved from a condition of social and political degradation, and not to gratify feelings of revenge, or to indulge in assaults on the British Empire that would be silly, if not mischievous, and would retard Ireland's progress under the most favorable government. Besides, the Irish in America want to be relieved from a heavy drain on their resources in having to assist their rack-rented friends in Ireland."

A third says: "I know of no such Irish-Americans as Lord Salisbury speaks of, and never heard of them."

A fourth remarks: "It is not true that any respectable number of Irish-Americans would frustrate a measure of Home Rule. Irish-Americans have shown beyond question their position in favor of the contra of your question."

A fifth adds: "The Irish people in Ireland will find more profitable employment in building up the prosperity of the country, and Irish-Americans would never advise a course that they know would be ruinous to their prosperity."

Question 2.—"Are they prepared, in your opinion, without mortgaging future generations in any way, to accept, as a reasonable settlement, Mr. Gladstone's measure recently passed by the House of Commons and rejected by the House of Lords?"

Answers.—"Yes, if given a fair trial the people of Ireland could demonstrate to England and Scotland that Home Rule would satisfy their national aspirations. With its possession they would regard the material and commercial interests of the two countries identical and that united, the people of these islands could pursue a career of prosperity and greatness."

A second says: "They are prepared to accept Mr. Gladstone's measure in the same spirit that the Irish parliamentary party, representing them, accepted it."

A third says: "We are not agitating for ourselves, but for our kinsmen in Ireland, and when they are satisfied we will also be content."

A fourth says: "Irish-Americans are prepared frankly to accept the Home Rule bill of Mr. Gladstone as a settlement, subject to such ways and judicious amendment as not only the Irish people will need but the English people, under its operation, will recognize to be necessary to insure, in full measure, the practical purpose and spirit of the settlement."

A fifth says: "Irish-Americans are prepared to accept Gladstone's bill as a settlement, because the people of Ireland have declared their acceptance of it through their representative Parnell accepted the bill of 1886 for the whole Irish race, and there was not heard a murmur of dissent from any one authorized to speak for them."

Question 3.—"Whether do Irish-Americans, in your opinion, *reciprocate*, or *repudiate*, the closing sentiment of Mr. Gladstone's speech, February 15, 1893, on the second reading of the Home Rule bill, where, after appealing to England to do justice to his suffering sister, he addressed himself to both nations in the light of joint opportunities, in these words: 'Let me entreat you—let it were my latest breath I would so entreat you—let the dead past bury its dead—cast behind you forever the recollection of bygone evils, and cherish, love, and sustain one another through all the vicissitudes of human affairs in the times that are to come.' What do you think of this sentiment?"

Answers.—"I believe an overwhelming majority of Irish-Americans reciprocate Mr. Gladstone's noble sentiments."

A second writes: "Irish-Americans, in my opinion, reciprocate the noble sentiments uttered by Mr. Gladstone, February 15, 1893. I think the sentiments are sublime."

A third says: "It was a plea for forgetfulness and forgiveness of the bitter past and for love and union in the future. It is also my sentiment on the subject."

A fourth writes: "Irish-Americans heartily reciprocate Mr. Gladstone's views; only human fiends could oppose them."

A fifth writes: "Yes, we will learn to forget the wrongs of England in the noble attitude of justice assumed by the English people of the present."

Question 4.—"Would Irish-Americans encourage their kinsmen at home to nurture religious and racial hatreds, make Catholicity the state church, and give to its hierarchy the control of education and of all legislative enactments?"

Answers.—"No, we want church and state forever separate, with complete freedom of worship guaranteed to all creeds."

A second writes: "No. We do not believe for a moment that the Catholics of Ireland would abridge in the slightest degree the exercise of the fullest and fairest enjoyment of civil and religious liberty. A state church of any kind is out of the question."

A third writes: "Irish-Americans realize that religious animosity has been the bane of Irish nationality. We want it abolished by the suppression of all the appearance of a state-aided religion. A creed that cannot stand upon its merits and rely upon the support of those to whom it appeals ought to be buried as a relic of the past."

A fourth says: "Such a question as you propose, in this day of intelligence, is surprising. The history of the Irish race, both in Ireland and America, is a living answer in the negative to your question. It is not the Catholic in Ireland or America who introduces as a political factor race or religion in politics."

A fifth writes: "The history of Ireland shows the broadest toleration of religious opinions among Catholics: witness their treatment of Protestant fellow-countrymen in those provinces outnumbering them in proportion of four to one. Irish-Americans are even more tolerant than their kinsmen in Ireland."

Question 5.—"Do Irish-Americans really hate the British people, who, like the Irish people themselves, have been the victims of centuries of misrule, and who until lately have had no adequate voice in controlling legislation in Parliament?"

Answers.—"Certainly not. On the contrary, we have an abid-

ing faith in the future of an English democracy, and hope that a united democracy will one day govern both England and Ireland in peace and happiness."

A second writes: "No. On the contrary, they are in full sympathy with them and are most anxious that the masses should compel the classes to acknowledge their rights in every particular."

A third writes: "Great Britain is not responsible for the results of British government in Ireland. We would like to coöperate with the masses there to abolish the classes who alone we hold responsible for Ireland's wrongs, and a typical representative of whom is the Marquis of Salisbury."

A fourth says: "The Irish-Americans do not hate the British people. They do hate Toryism and all that it represents, and yet were Toryism to be the instrument of justice to Ireland, they could forgive Toryism and forget all its cursed, cruel, and dark past."

A fifth writes: "They hate the spirit of persecution and tyranny that has marked the treatment of Ireland by England. In so far as that spirit is upheld by the people of Great Britain they hate them as the instruments of their oppression. Whenever a spirit of friendship and amity is manifested to them they are ready to make common calls upon them for the best interests of both countries."

Question 6.—"Do the Irish-Americans hate the British Empire, its flag, its trade, and Constitution, as stated by Lord Salisbury, and would a granting of Home Rule reconcile them to the supremacy of the British Empire, as asserted by Lord Salisbury?"

Answers.—"Irish-Americans hate 'things British,' her empire and her flag, in so far as they represent the ages of persecution and spoliation. How could they be human and feel otherwise until some reparation is made by the transgressors?"

A second says: "The granting of Home Rule would obliterate whatever hostilities there are, and would completely change the feelings entertained on the part of Irish-Americans into friendship for both the English government and the English people."

A third writes: "Justice to Ireland will conciliate the masses of Irish-American people; Lord Salisbury is wrong, Lord Roseberry is right."

A fourth says: "The Irish-American recognizes and loves whatever is good in the British Constitution. We don't hate anything British merely because it is British, but because the word stands for wrong or injustice in Ireland. If the cause is abolished the result will be different. We cannot continue kicking a man all the time and expect him to love; even Homer, whom we rate as little less than a god, bitterly cursed those people in Greece whom he found on the banks of the Eurotas."

A fifth says: "Yes. We hate them all—flag, trade, and Constitution—while they symbolize the slavery and persecution of our people. When they become the emblems of justice, freedom, and fair play to the people of Ireland, we will no longer have reason to hate them."

Question 7.—"Whether, in your opinion, is Ireland better off holding the balance of power in the imperial Parliament, with the local legislature at Dublin, and having an outlet for the genius of her sons to a friendly partnership with England over an area of one fifth of the globe, and sharing in the government of one fourth of its population, or existing independent and alone, taxed to sustain a large standing army and a defensive fleet, an object of jealousy to neighboring powers, with a king, a parliament, and a flag of her own."

Answers.—"I am satisfied that with Home Rule for Ireland the genius of her sons would also seek the still wider field of imperial affairs for an opportunity to participate in the affairs of the greater Empire. Irishmen all over the world would take pride in the advancement of imperial affairs under such circumstances, and there is little doubt that England and Ireland would march in progress and prosperity down the ages to a glorious and a common destiny."

A second writes: "In my opinion, Ireland would be vastly better off under the conditions you state, as undoubtedly a friendly partnership with England would give Ireland an oppor-

tunity for trade and commerce that would greatly tend to the national growth. As for an Irish king, I think such a creature is out of the question."

A third says: "My belief is that with equal rights granted the the Irish people would advance more rapidly as a part of the empire than by standing separately and distinctly outside of it."

A fourth says: "In my opinion, both Ireland and England will be benefited by having Ireland represented in the field of the Parliament. Ireland's best interests rest in friendly relations and an alliance with England. To cast Ireland on her own resources after centuries of devastation would be a cruel injustice, abhorrent to the civilization of this age, and a policy well calculated to make Ireland a prey to political schemes and intrigues. I believe that with full justice accorded to their country Irishmen would become the truest, most loyal, and safest custodians of imperial power, honor, dignity, and greatness—Britain's choicest citizens."

A fifth says: "Under the conditions you name Ireland would be more prosperous as a part of the British Empire. Freed from the cost of maintaining separate powers for defense, the preservation of law, etc., her resources could also be more readily available for the development of her national industries and her people enjoy the benefits of a staple government."

Such is the spirit in which men have answered the questions propounded to them. In every case the quotations are made with literal exactness, the originals being in my possession. There is probably throughout a desire to deal lightly with the question relating to the religious controversies, and in many cases a reference will be observed to the past history of Catholics in their relations to the minority. This, however, may attract objections in some quarters, since the past history of Catholics and Protestants has been deplorable rather than reassuring, both parties being about equally to blame, but it is remarkable with what unanimity all the letters received have testified to a change of feeling that would arise in this country toward Ireland by the granting of Home Rule. In other years there have been only one answer to some of these questions, p

ularly that relating to hatred of England. That answer would be a loud, unanimous, and emphatic "Yes," but owing to the Christian and civilizing character of Mr. Gladstone's legislation, a great change has come over the spirit of Irish-Americans. Irishmen in America have grown and prospered with the times. In America this is more particularly true than in Ireland, and living here in a country which takes in the whole people of Europe, Irishmen are no longer thirsting for the humiliation of the British Empire. They have, as Tennyson says, "Grown at last beyond the passions of the primal clan." They desire not separation from the British Empire, but a recognition of their historic and inextinguishable nationality, and, owing to the sweet influence reflected upon the public opinion of this country by Mr. Gladstone's recent legislation, it is now possible to get a fair and reasonable statement of what was once a burning question. Those who have not answered the above questions categorically have sent letters. We shall begin with Dr. Thomas Addis Emmet, the grand-nephew of Robert Emmet whose name has been the inspiring spirit of all Irish revolutionary movements of the present century. What St. Peter is to the Catholic church, Robert Emmet is to the spirit of Irish patriotism. The grand-nephew of Robert Emmet resides in New York and has this to say of Lord Salisbury's Trowbridge speech.

My belief is that the Irish people as a whole can be fully conciliated and in our day may prosper and live in unity as part of the British Empire. The Irish people are willing to-day, it is believed, to accept in good faith from the British government the Home Rule bill as passed by the House of Commons. It will be received by the thinking portion of the Irish race as the only and the last existing means for preserving Irish nationality, the Irish language, literature, and traditions. Every sensible man will concede that it is the wildest species of speculation to legislate for a condition that may never arise; the future must take care of itself. I state, without fear of being challenged, that it will rest on the good faith of English people toward their neighbors in Ireland, whether the future between them shall be one of weakness and brute force, as in the past, or exist as a bond of strength in mutual interest and good feeling. If we can judge from the history of the past, and we have no right to base a supposition as to the future on any other ground, the fear expressed by Lord Salisbury of religious intolerance by the Catholic majority is equally absurd, and is scarcely worthy

of consideration. Not a single authentic instance of intolerance on the part of the Catholics of Ireland, during the past two hundred years, can be cited ; while it can easily be shown that all the religious disturbance during this period has directly or indirectly emanated from the Orangemen. Throwing aside all sentiment and simply looking to the best good of Ireland in her connection with the circumstances existing to-day, and over which she is powerless to exert any control, I sincerely believe that her condition is best as a part of the British Empire ; far preferred, indeed, to the accepting of her independence on her present state, even if it were freely tendered by England.

It is easy to see that Dr. Emmet agrees with the view of another Irishman, Richard Lolor Shiel, who once stated that "the vision of an independent Ireland was a glorious but unattainable fancy;" and the sentiments are entirely worthy of Dr. Emmet as the descendant of the most chivalrous of Irish patriots, and of an age which forbids revolutionists to disturb the interchange of commerce ; which sees ideas of right and justice all but over-whelm over the time-honored profession of arms ; which beholds in England the First Citizen of the greatest of modern empires espouse the cause of a sister nation long neglected by his fellow countrymen, and which rejoices as the sons of the patriot, Lord South, settled down in Hungary to work out their destinies under the peaceful rule of the Hapsburgs.

Some of those to whom these questions were forwarded boldly assert that instead of being enemies to British trade or commerce, Irish-Americans are the best friends of the commerce of Great Britain. Mr. P. T. Barry, President of the Chicago National Paper Union, writing in reply, says:

Lord Salisbury and his associates are too familiar with the details of political affairs throughout the world not to be aware that instead of the Irish-American influence being a danger to British trade and commerce, on the contrary, it is far more threatening to American trade and commerce. Lord Salisbury and his associates know, and they say daily in the public press of England, that the political party in the United States with which Irish-Americans associate themselves most cordially is the exponent in the New World of British trade ideas, and is lauded for such by English statesmen and by the organs of British commerce. There is not an Irish-American in Congress to-day who is not on record as having voted for a measure, the passage of which would injure the American Congress the commercial world of England so much as to injure the commercial world of America on the other hand so much

The Tammany politicians of New York, against whom Lord Salisbury inveighs as Irish-American influence dangerous to British trade, as well as their associate office-holders and office-seekers elsewhere in the United States, use their political influence to extend and amplify British trade ideas through the political party in which they are, if not a dominant, at least a very strong factor. Lord Salisbury will find that these Irish-American politicians are not on record in the past quarter of a century as having contributed anything to the great movement in Ireland by money or support, which made it worthy of recognition throughout the world and brought it to the front in the affairs of British legislation. That movement was supported and sustained, not by Irish-American politicians or office-seekers, but by Irish-American business men and others of the race engaged in the professions and other occupations. I protest, then, against the saddling upon the Irish question, which has never received any support from them, the shortcomings of a lot of Tammany and other Irish-American politicians, whose influence has most notoriously been up to this for the advancement of British trade in the United States, together with procuring offices for themselves from the American public.

Hon. W. Bourke Cochran, speaking on the subject, says :

Forgotten to-day are the wrongs and the oppressions of 700 years. Forgiven is the violence under which the Irish race has suffered for long ages. The wrongs which Irishmen have borne were not inflicted by the masses of the English people. The aristocrats who profited by their injuries no longer control the destinies of England. The resentment which has been provoked by the oppressions of their enemies is forgotten in the gratitude which they freely bestow upon their deliverers. Ireland has no vengeance to be assuaged in blood. She looks forward to a future radiant with glorious promise ; a future of peace, of prosperity, of intellectual and commercial developments ; a future wherein decaying cities will spring into new life, where deserted harbors will become crowded with the argosies of a prosperous commerce, where the river by whose murmuring waters the shamrock spreads its verdant leaves will sweep by abundant fields and thriving villages, where the smoke rising from happy and contented homes will be an incense borne to the beneficent God whose justice will never be offended by deeds of rapine or violence, whose vengeance will never be provoked by the wanton shedding of innocent blood. And as they turn their backs upon the days of gloom and of disaster, as they turn their faces to the future with its glorious promise and its radiant light, Irishmen and the sons of Irishmen will ever cherish in their bosoms the memory of that illustrious Englishman who stands to-day before the eyes of the world crowned with imperishable glory, under whose heel we see the extinct torch, the broken fetter, the shattered bludgeon of coercion, in whose hand we see the charter of liberty, on whose head descend the blessings of two nations. When his long and glorious career shall

have been ended, his enduring monument will be in the breasts of the people, whose memories of hatred he has turned to feelings of grateful affection, who have learned to forget that England was the land of Cromwell because England was the land of Gladstone.

Mr. Hugh McCaffery, a prominent business man of Philadelphia, and ex-president of the Irish-National League of America in the days when that organization existed and when it remitted to Ireland a sum of nearly half a million of dollars, writes :

Whatever hatred Ireland has for England is due to the injustice and misgovernment of the latter country, and this hatred has been gradually dying out since the English people have evinced a disposition to do Ireland justice, and would entirely disappear if they were to call for Ireland Home Rule. Irish-Americans expect nothing from Lord Salisbury and the Lords of England, but they do confidently expect that the masses of English people will have the innate sense of justice and fair play through their representatives in Parliament to grant Home Rule to the suffering people of Ireland. When that day comes, mistrust and persecution will soon be dispelled, religious prejudices will be lessened, the two peoples will be drawn together, and "England's treatment of the Irish" will no longer be a blot upon civilization.

Hon. Allen McDermott, chairman of the Democratic State Committee and clerk in chancery of New Jersey, writes:

To say that any civilized people to-day hate any other people is to speak misleadingly. Even the spirit of animosity between the French and Germans is not a personal hatred. A Frenchman doesn't hate a German, nor does a German dislike a Frenchman as such. There is rivalry between their respective nations a feeling of rivalry and jealousy created able to neither, but the element of personal hatred is absent from the international attitude. So as between the English and the Irish, the dislike is not personal, the advocates of Home Rule in Ireland do not hate the people in England. Irish-Americans have not any dislike for English-Americans, nor would Lord Salisbury find here any intelligent endorsement of his view that Irish-Americans are opposed to the prosperity of England. The truth is, that the Irish and Irish-Americans who are believers in the right of local self-government, are only opposed to that party in Parliament which denies self-government to Ireland. Parnell didn't hate England; the Irish do not hate England. If Lord Salisbury will learn to be true to the teachings of Christ, if he will learn to be true to himself, if he will become true to the genius of the nineteenth century, let him preach the true doctrine that the government of men by men should have nothing to do with any sect—that men should be taught to love one another. Let him teach that the mission of government is to secure human happiness, not to set man against his fellow. Then will Lord Salisbury have secured the admiration which he seeks on this side of the Atlantic.

Mr. James T. Doyle, vice-president of the Irish National Federation for the state of Maryland, and one of the editors of the *Baltimore American*, writes:

If there is one quality for which above all others the Irish people are noted, it is the quality of generosity, of sympathy, of forgiveness. The Irish people have let the dead past bury its dead. If I may be pardoned a personal reference in this connection, let me say that outside of my own immediate family, the dearest friend I have on earth is of English parentage. His father and my own, both now passed into the one enduring kingdom, were likewise warm comrades, and only a few weeks ago his mother closed the eyes of mine in death, and wept as for a sister. About her bier were gathered many families of English and Irish birth or extraction, all on terms of amity and of intimacy. This I have found to be the rule among the two peoples, not the exception. The masses of the English acknowledge the justice of Ireland's claims, and the Irish people recognize and applaud the honest efforts of the Liberals to give them a bill that is satisfactory. There is only one obstacle in the way of complete harmony between the two countries, that is the House of Lords.

Major John Byrne is a prominent business man, with an office in Wall street and at Detroit, Mich. He personally subscribed \$5,000 to aid the campaign of the Irish party in 1891, and subsequently had an interview with Mr. Gladstone before the projection of the late Home Rule bill. Major Byrne says:

While every man with a drop of Irish blood in his veins, with a family past to remember, must naturally entertain a feeling against the laws of England, yet in that generosity and magnanimity which is a strong characteristic of the Irish, which secures by "one act of kindness atonement for an age of wrong," the people of their exiled brethren and descendants of other lands are ready to respond practically as they do in spirit, to Mr. Gladstone's appeal to his countrymen in his recent speech in Parliament. As a scion of an Irish house with centuries of bitter charges against England for almost every crime on the calendar, crimes perpetrated under protection, and often by direction, of law against helpless innocence, both in youth and old age, even noble womanhood, with a hatred in my heart as deep as in any man's living for England's past treatment of the land of my father, a feeling that even he, a political refugee, possessed—I am willing and anxious to bury the past to complete erasement, and even clasp hands with an honest, patriotic, just England, such as Mr. Gladstone represented—justice to Ireland being accomplished.

The language of these letters is worthy of the most serious attention on the part of all who value the future possibilities of the British Empire, and they are especially worthy of attention

on the part of those—no inconsiderable body of citizen America or in the United Kingdom—who foresee that the future of civilization may largely depend upon an alliance of the English-speaking branches of the Anglo-Norman race. Whoever casts his eye over the horizon of the world to-day must see three nations, like three towering peaks of the Himalayan mountains, rising above all others, namely, Russia, the United States, and the British Empire. And it is a fact of no little importance to be taken into account in connection with the future of this trio of great empires, that in two of them the Irish to-day actually holds the balance of power, and will therefore, whether for good or evil, largely influence the destinies of the future. With the Irish people in active opposition to an English-speaking alliance which the proximity of Canada may ultimately bring about, its consummation could not possibly be effected. Peace between Ireland and England is a step which will lift humanity visibly upwards, and give a direction to progress that cannot but affect the whole course of human development. Fortunately the Irish people have the best of reasons to see that the conflict between both nations ended. From 1848 to 1867 they have contributed, according to a speech of the Marquis of Dufferin delivered in the House of Lords in 1870, to their kinsmen in Ireland an amount exceeding \$65,000,000. Since that time between money contributed to pay the rents of Irish tenants and funds subscribed to the various movements aiming to deliver the people from the grasp of Irish landlordism, they have subscribed an amount which if put to interest and safely invested would at no distant day purchase the entire fee simple of the land from the British government at a fair valuation. In order to do this, Irish people in America have often pinched themselves and diminished their chances of material advancement in a country where money is the great object of life. They may be expected to continue this drain upon their resources through the ages. They have therefore the best of all possible reasons for a beneficent change in the relations of the two countries. But it is for the Tory party to decide whether they shall again arouse a feeling of resentment against Eng-

this country, or enable the Irish people to settle down here from a condition of perpetual unrest and permit their kinsmen at home to cast behind them forever the recollection of England's wrongs, and, realizing the joint opportunities of both nations as portions of one united empire, "cherish, love, and sustain one another through all the vicissitudes of human affairs in the times that are to come."

T. BURKE GRANT.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CIVICS.*

BY HENRY RANDALL WAITE, PH.D.

THIS institution represents the united and unselfish action of patriotic citizens devoted to the one purpose of promoting the qualities in citizenship which are essential to the integrity of our free institutions.

It seeks to give voice and force to the demand that the conditions necessary to successful popular government shall have the recognition accorded to similar conditions in other fields. The mean harvest is an open proclamation that meanness in capital, labor, and soil, will be multiplied meanness in fruit. It is to be expected that good government in a republic will be the result of civic thorns springing rank in the soil of ignorance, sluggishness, selfishness, and meanness. Always necessary, but never more than now, is a proper recognition of the fact that the husbandry of the soil of good government and right social order can be found only in good citizenship. That this fact is not duly recognized, that it is often disregarded or wholly ignored, needs no other demonstration than the object lessons afforded by the maladministration of public affairs, corruption in the Senate and other flagrant civic evils, manifest in towns, municipalities, and states. Civic vice has become thus positive and had its growth precisely to the extent that civic virtue is wholly disappearing or has faded into the vaporous sentiment of

AN IMPOTENT PATRIOTISM.

The imperative necessity of increased efforts to foster the qualities in the individual,—the unswerving integrity, the fidelity as to civic affairs, and the fidelity in the discharge of civic obligations,—which give commanding power to civic virtue, will not be questioned. Insufficient attention to

* Statement presented at the annual meeting of the board of trustees, Washington, D. C., May 23, 1894, by Henry Randall Waite, president of the Institute.

thus admittedly the concern of all good citizens, breaks every line of defense, and leaves open way for the entrance into power of vicious political elements, and the prostitution of the machinery of government to the basest uses. While the solidarity in good citizenship which will give it controlling power is thus everywhere wanting, the solidarity of selfishness and meanness will assuredly increase.

The Institute of Civics * asks citizens of all parties and creeds to unite in persistent endeavors to counteract these dangerous tendencies, by promoting the civic intelligence, love of justice, sense of duty, and instinct of honor, which shall give supremacy to good citizenship, and make the suffrage, parties, public leaders, officials, and all the machinery of civil life, wholly contributory to good government and right social order. At the end of nine years of its labors, we may profitably, and with an honorable pride not unmixed with sadness (for many of the number have left us to become full citizens of a greater commonwealth), recall the names of some of the founders and first members of this institution.

FOUNDERS AND FIRST MEMBERS.

Among these were Chief Justice Waite and Justices Strong, Miller, and Lamar of the United States Supreme Court; United States Senators Hawley, Colquitt, Blair, and J. F. Wilson; College Presidents Woolsey and Porter, of Yale; Barnard, of Columbia; Hopkins, of Williams; Johnston, of Tulane University of New Orleans; MacCracken, University, City of New York; Seeley and Gates, of Amherst; Brown, of Hamilton; Scoville, of Wooster; Northrop, of the University of Minnesota; Butterfield, of Olivet; Canfield, University of Nebraska; Peabody, of the University of Illinois; Blanton, University of Kentucky; Capen, of Tufts; Snow, of Washington (Mo.) University; Potter, of Hobart; Andrews, of Brown University; Waggoner, University of Texas; Buckham, University of Vermont; Dreher, Roanoke; Turner, University of West Virginia;

*The term "Civics," a new word introduced into use by the Institute, was adopted as a distinguishing title because regarded as a suitable designation for the body of knowledge, or science, which concerns itself solely with the interests and reciprocal relations of the citizen and the state.

and Hoyt, University of Wyoming. Among others who gave immediate support as members were U. S. Grant, Samuel Tilden, George Bancroft, Bishop Coxe, Hugh McCullough, John Bigelow, Stephen A. Walker, and Theodore W. Dwight. Robert C. Winthrop, of Boston, said, "I cannot hesitate for a moment to accept"; Hubert H. Bancroft, of San Francisco, wrote "*There is no work in which men are engaged which is more needed*"; John Clarke Ridpath, of Indiana, declared, "*The cause is one of the worthiest for which men ever put themselves side by side*"; and Prof. John LeConte said, "THE TIME HAS COME WHEN AN INSTITUTION LIKE THIS IS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY."

The practical wisdom of those who shaped the plans of the Institute, is evidenced by the fact that these years have brought but little change in the provisions relating to

MANAGEMENT AND MEMBERSHIP.

Control is vested now, as at first, in thirty-three trustees chosen for periods of one, two, and three years, who elect their own successors. Provisions made for a faculty, an advisory board composed of members specially qualified for assistance in the formation of plans, are unchanged. The immediate supervision of its affairs was entrusted to its President and the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. Following the plans then made, it now has corresponding members of its faculty in a majority of American colleges and professional schools, a large and useful corps of lecturers, and the coöperation of a steadily growing body of councilors, composed of citizens of the highest character in all parts of the country, chosen with a view to their willingness and ability to render useful service unitedly or as individuals.

The Institute has sought, and still seeks, the coöperation of intelligent and unselfish citizens, both men and women, in all communities throughout the land. Among such there are none who may not accept some share, however little, in its popular, patriotic activities, since the obligations assumed by members are voluntary.

The successful conduct of a work so wide in scope has required suitable financial provisions, the dependence for which has

solely upon voluntary contributions, made in response to annual circulars which have suggested but have not exacted small minimum dues. The voluntary payments often made in excess of the amount suggested, have evidenced the appreciative interest of many citizens. The Institute has never *employed a salaried officer or paid agent.*

METHODS OF COÖPERATION.

Methods of coöperation have been suggested, but not prescribed. Presenting a common and noble purpose, the Institute has called to its membership only those willing to aid in its accomplishment; but the character and the extent of this aid has been chiefly determined by individual judgment, according to personal and local conditions and opportunities. Members as individuals, or in connection with local councils, at the cost of little effort, have rendered such aid. They have done this by interesting popular organizations in the discussion of citizenship duties; by lectures, or provision for lectures (free when possible), before lyceums, workingmen's clubs, young men's associations, and other suitable organizations, secular and religious; by securing the salutary observance of patriotic anniversaries; by promoting adequate instruction in civics in schools; by coöperation in efforts to secure the wise and honest administration of public affairs; by promoting the local and state legislation and other action necessary to purity of the ballot, honesty and efficiency in the civil service, the integrity and highest usefulness of the public schools, the maintenance of law and order, and the promotion of social purity.

The Institute also presents plans intended to secure coöperative effort on the part of all suitable organizations, such as the sons and daughters of the heroes of the Revolution, the surviving soldiers of the Civil War, the various noble associations of American women, Young People's Christian Endeavor and Epworth League societies, and other non-partisan organizations whose aims are such as to assure their sympathy with its objects. These objects should be represented by interested citizens, not only in many, but in all communities, and its membership should include all who are willing to unite in patriotic and unselfish en-

deavors to promote and give power to the spirit of "true Americanism."

THE INSTITUTE'S FIRST EFFORTS

were to arouse a deeper public sense of the importance of the civic energies which it sought to call into action. It has undoubtedly helped to incite the serious thought and unselfish patriotism out of which such energies spring. Whether its own instrumentality be recognized or not, and whatever the part which it may have in directing them, this result alone will justify every effort made for its accomplishment. If it can also aid in giving to these aroused energies unity, purpose, and wise direction, it will have accomplished another most important aim. It shall secure, through patriotic liberality, endowments befitting a national institution devoted to the promotion of ideas and activities essential to the welfare of our free institutions, its permanent usefulness will be assured, and the hopes of its founders, many of them no longer living, will be realized.

SUMMARY REPORT AS TO PROGRESS.

The following statements as to work in the several departments of the Institute, cannot fail to give increased encouragement and zeal to all citizens who share in any way in endeavoring to safeguard our free institutions by exalting the standard of citizenship.

I.—*Department of Popular Work.*—In this department efforts are made to promote "good government through good citizenship," by utilizing the opportunities afforded in connection with national holidays; through addresses before lyceums, labor unions, and other popular organizations, and in various other ways. This department has the aid of a large corps of lecturers, including many men of national reputation.

Correspondence has been recently conducted with the Institute's lecturers, in pursuance of plans calculated to largely increase the usefulness of the lyceum feature of its work. As a result a statement has been prepared, setting forth the purpose and plans of this department, with the names of lecturers and the topics upon which they will speak. This statement, which appears elsewhere, will undoubtedly result in widely extended

the Institute's influence, by increasing the number of its active assistants in the lecture field, as well as the number of audiences addressed.

The efforts made to secure the observance of national holidays, in accordance with the plans of the Institute, have met with increased success, and have commanded, as hitherto, the cordial coöperation of secular, religious, and educational newspapers, and of clergymen, teachers, and other interested members and friends of the Institute, throughout the country.

The work already accomplished, through measures calculated to stimulate popular interest in the study and discussion of questions of public importance, has increased the demands upon the Institute for literature relating to these subjects, and for the services of those qualified to set them forth in popular addresses. The services of patriotic citizens, possessing the highest qualifications, can everywhere be commanded as lecturers; and, with provisions for the defrayal of the necessary expenses of the undertaking, the Institute can easily make provision for popular addresses or informal talks, calculated to arouse efforts in furtherance of its aims on the part of members of trade unions, young men's clubs, societies of Christian Endeavor, Epworth Leagues, and other suitable organizations, in all parts of the country. The Institute's entire dissociation from partisan politics, and the fact that its members everywhere include the most honored and respected representatives of all parties, creeds, and classes, commends it to all organizations which have worthy aims, and leads them to grant a willing audience to its representatives.

II.—*Department of Public School Work.*—Devoted to the promotion, in coöperation with public school officers and teachers, of such instruction as shall most fully qualify American youth for the discharge of civic obligations. The coöperation of the young in efforts to secure this end is sought through the extension, into all public schools, of plans calculated to promote, not only patriotism, but the character and intelligence without which patriotism may be nothing more than an aimless and fruitless sentiment.

The progress in this department continues to be most encouraging. There are few important meetings in the interest of public education, national, state, or local, in connection with which the members or friends of the Institute do not present for consideration the study of civics. The increased attention given to civics by instructors in normal schools and teachers' institutes is also a matter of gratification. These results are chiefly due to the efforts of individual members who appreciate and thus seek to promote, the objects of the Institute. With a view to meeting the demand of teachers and others for such matter, the Institute has secured the services of some of the ablest educators among its members, who have furnished, in brief and popular form, suggestions which will appear from time to time in the magazine, as to methods of public school instruction in civics.

The aims of the Institute, as set forth by enthusiastic teachers, have also awakened an interest on the part of children in many schools, and in some instances have led to juvenile school organizations (conducted under the auspices of teachers), intended to prepare the way for good citizenship. It is believed that through such organizations the young may be led to interest themselves more deeply in the elementary truths vitally related to the welfare of their country, its institutions, and its people, and that incalculable good may be accomplished by their multiplication. The importance of entering upon some general and popular method of work with this end in view was recognized by the Institute's trustees two years ago, when plans for such work were carefully formulated with the assistance and approval of many representative teachers. Meanwhile the fact has been clearly established that both teachers and children can be depended upon for coöperation. The success of the efforts already made in this direction, through the agency of the late George T. Balch, of New York (one of the most zealous and faithful of the officers), Prof. Myron T. Prichard, and Francis Morse, of Boston, and many other members of the Institute indicates that the time is ripe for the enlistment of teachers everywhere, and multitudes of young people, in efforts for the promotion of the intelligent, vigilant, and faithful patriotism, in p

aration for which our public schools will more fully realize their highest ends. There are few undertakings which present a stronger appeal to patriotic citizens who desire to promote the future as well as the present welfare of the country, than that of organizing our millions of school children into an eager, thoughtful, hopeful army, whose members shall be pledged to seek, and shall receive, such preparation of mind and heart as shall properly equip them for the battles which must be fought in their day in defense of the integrity of our free institutions.

III.—*Business School Department.*—In this department, The Business Educators' Association of America, having made itself an auxiliary of the Institute for the purpose, coöperates with its officers in endeavors to introduce in all business schools such instruction as shall more thoroughly prepare the more than sixty thousand youths in yearly attendance on such schools for the duties of citizenship.

The secretary of this department has in hand the preparation of suitable plans for uniform instruction in civics in business schools. As chairman he has charge of the department of the World's Congress, at Chicago, devoted to business education. The highly successful and interesting meetings of this department of the World's Congress served to emphasize the importance, among educational institutions, of schools devoted to business training, and the wisdom of maintaining a department of the Institute through which efforts are made to promote instruction in civics among the youth in yearly attendance upon such schools.

IV.—*College and Professional School Department.*—With the aid of associate members of the faculty of the Institute, appointed for that purpose (see statement page—), this department seeks to promote in all higher institutions of learning, such attention to the essential principles of republican government, practically as well as philosophically considered, as shall make high scholarship a synonym for the best citizenship, and a preparation for best service in public stations.

The most important undertaking of the year in this department has been the distribution among the colleges of a syllabus

relating to instruction in civics. The comments upon this paper returned in answer to the Institute's request, indicate a greatly increased interest in the promotion of instruction in civics. Some of the instructors addressed have furnished valuable suggestions as to methods of instruction, the substance of which will be published in a later issue of the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS.

There has also been a marked increase of interest in the competition for the "Hall Prizes," awarded to graduating members of colleges who submit the most meritorious theses upon subjects suggested by the Institute. Awards were made in the year 1893 to students in the following institutions: Bowdon College, Ga.; St. Stephen's College, New York; Trinity College, Carolina; and the University of Indiana.

V.—*Department of the Press.*—Devoted to the preparation and publication of literature helpful to the Institute's objects, the publications of the last year have included a new edition of "Organized Patriotism," and articles as follows: "American Town Government," by Edward Everett; "Municipal Government," etc., by Albert Shaw, editor of *Review*; "The Rights of Minorities and Majorities," by Hon. John A. Kasson; "Political Ideals," by W. C. C. Binson; "Our Standing Army," by Major General O. O. Howard; "The Relation of the Clergy to Crime and the Poor Classes," by Rev. Henry Lewis Myrick; a third edition of a masterly oration on the National Constitution, by the late Justice S. F. Miller, of the United States Supreme Court; articles by Caspar T. Hopkins, recently deceased, on Congressional Reform, the Education of the Politician, and Some Principles in Economics and Politics; Citizenship, with chapters on Unrealized Ideals, The Voter in Search of his Rights, Delegate Election, and Citizenship and the Schools, by A. Brinley; a Historical Sketch of the Institute, its by-laws, etc., and other valuable papers.

The publication of the "Quinquennial Register," containing the roll of members, has been delayed owing to the fact that many members to return to the registrar the blank form for desired information.

VI.—*Department of Legislation.*—In coöperation with members in the several states, it is thought through this department to secure the study of, and to promote, legislation calculated to assure the proper administration of public affairs, to protect and elevate the suffrage, and to give, in all the states, such form to laws affecting the social order as shall make them uniform, just, and effective in their operation.

Pursuant to the purposes above indicated, after extended correspondence, plans have been perfected for securing the coöperation of distinguished citizens in the several states possessed of special qualification, who are to be members of a body known as "The Interstate Commission on Law Reform of the American Institute of Civics." This undertaking has commanded the cordial approval and assistance of the governors of twenty-six states, and like coöperation will doubtless be received from the governors of the remaining states.

The complete organization, and the efficient prosecution of the carefully matured plans of this Commission, with results of the highest importance and utility, it is hoped will not be long delayed.

Facilities for efficient work have been largely increased by the securing of suitable executive offices (38 Park Row), provided by the generosity of the late Hon. O. B. Potter, one of the Institute's trustees, in the Potter Building, one of the most desirable and centrally located office buildings in New York.

These summary statements clearly indicate the field of the Institute's activities, and its wide opportunities for enlisting influential citizens in patriotic and useful labors; but they do not permit of detailed information as to the efficient local work accomplished by its members in the several states, individually, or through local organizations.

Popular uprisings for the overthrow of civic corruption betoken a public sentiment favorable to efforts which shall apply to civic evils a surer remedy than the strokes of spasmodic public wrath, following the exposure of official inefficiency or corruption. A controlling sentiment based on intelligent views of civics; righteous action on the part of the grand juries which

render their decisions through the suffrage, this will be the realization of a "Triumphant Democracy," based on the solid foundation of good citizenship.

In a commendatory editorial the New York *Mail and Express* says, "that the Institute is in the fore front in a great patriotic movement that nothing can prevent from going forward, is undisputable." Such words are encouraging and helpful; their warrant must be in future as well as past labors and results.

Increased financial support is imperatively necessary in order to vigorous and progressive work, and the members and friends of the Institute have abundant reasons for continuing or enlarging the measure of their assistance. For this, the officers who serve the Institute without compensation feel that they are at the right unhesitatingly and confidently to ask.

HENRY RANDALL W.

THE MOVEMENT FOR GOOD CITY GOVERNMENT.

BY HERBERT WELSH.

THE question of good city government is not local; it does not concern only a city here or a city there—Pittsburg, Philadelphia, or New York—but it is general over the United States. Its national character was shown by the representation of great cities made at the conference for good city government, held in Philadelphia during the past winter, by the many eminent men who thought it worth while to attend that conference, by the patriotic enthusiasm which characterized their utterances, and by the manifest sentiment expressed that the issue was a national one. But the national character of the movement is still more clearly shown by developments since the conference. A National Municipal Reform League is in process of formation, delegates to which met for organization in New York, at the City Club House, May 28 and 29. In preparation for this organized movement the committee charged with the work received letters from correspondents in many of the large cities and towns of the United States stretching clear across the continent—Albany, Troy, Buffalo, N. Y.; Providence, R. I.; Boston, Mass.; Baltimore, Md.; Milwaukee, Wis.; St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn.; Columbus, Ohio; Denver and Pueblo, Col.; San Francisco and Los Angeles, Cal.; Tacoma and Seattle, Wash.; Birmingham, Ala.; Sheboygan, Wis.; and many other places have given us information of reform organizations and movements existing in them, and of their desire to associate with organizations of a similar kind existing elsewhere.

It would seem clear, then, that bad city government may be found existing very generally over the country, justifying the criticism of Mr. Bryce, the author of the "American Commonwealth," that the government of American cities is the one conspicuous failure in the United States.

What is the essential nature of this failure among a people of so marked intelligence, virtue, and practical ability as our own? Inefficiency and dishonesty; in the proper high acceptation of that last word, *dishonesty* mainly.

What is the cause of such failure? Mainly the indifference, the civic non-education of the mass of our good people, who have not yet been sufficiently chastised by bitter experience to have learned the great political truth that standards of rigid public morality and efficiency are necessary not alone to the material well-being of a city, but to the safety and efficiency of the country at large. Once lower these standards of public morality so there is a general tolerance of unscrupulous men and dishonest practices in public life, and a decay of national character and national institutions sets in, which will soon bring about conditions highly menacing to the moral and material welfare of the country. Public affairs, when the general virtue and intelligence of the country become suspicious of them and fall out of close touch with them, like decaying animal or vegetable organisms, by their feebleness invite the attacks of parasites. With this ebb of popular sense of responsibility and conscientious devotion to public affairs comes in the purely mercenary politician, who employs the names of parties and their creeds as a cloak for his personal advancement and money-gathering. This type of man wears the party livery simply as a matter of convenience, and so the better to attain his object. He is usually wholly indifferent to the principles which the party professes. Does any one doubt that Gorman, of Maryland, and Croker, of New York, would be Republicans in Pennsylvania or that Quay and David Martin would be Democrats in New York? The question, then, becomes one of profound moral significance, for it is in effect this: "Shall popular government become the prey of the unscrupulous self-seeker, who subordinates public interests and moral considerations to his own personal gain and personal power? Or shall all public office be considered as a sacred trust for recording the vote and securing the welfare of the people?" Is it claiming much to say that according to the popular answer given

question will be the success or failure of popular government?

Now, the city is the great center of political force, of intellectual force, of money force. Its influence upon national politics is immense, if not decisive. The question of good city government is in effect the question of good national government. The point should especially be emphasized that it is a moral question of profound significance, probably as profound as that which caused the War of Secession, which was the slavery question. The slavery question asked us whether one man had the right to pocket another man's wages, to exercise supreme control over another man's body. Divergent views on that matter nearly dismembered the country.

Now, this question asks whether small bands of disciplined mercenaries are to prey upon public office, to falsify election returns, to bribe or intimidate voters, to be guilty of gross dishonesty, and yet retain office; whether great corporations are justified in purchasing legislation, in employing the machine as an agency for permanently corrupting politics in order that their ends may be the more effectually served; whether city franchises which are worth many million dollars to taxpayers shall be given by bribed city councilmen to corporations for the asking.

The answer to this question may, and doubtless will, come in a far less dramatic way than that given to the slavery question, but who can say that it is less necessary that there should be an answer? It is only a very superficial thinker or a very indifferent citizen who will suggest that the problem will solve itself. Almost all the large cities of the United States furnish abundant illustrations of the moral and material evils which proceed from bad city government, which is itself the outgrowth of widespread popular indifference, and the consequent capture of municipal offices by a class of men whose course shows them to be animated mainly by a desire for personal gain. New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Buffalo, Troy, are cases in point. The conditions in these cities vary somewhat; in New York the evils of machine government are in some respects more flagrant, but are not perhaps more dangerous than in those of the other cities named.

The newspapers of some cities, which are themselves suffering scandalous and dangerous abuses, feel that it is pleasant and safe to moralize upon the wickedness of Tammany rather than to call attention to the necessity for a local house cleaning. Last autumn the nomination of Maynard, who had been guilty of fraud in connection with election returns, to a place on the Supreme Bench of the state of New York, and Dr. Parkhurst's great work in proving beyond a peradventure the direct complicity of Tammany with crime, produced a popular uprising which is being organized and guided by the New York City Club and its associated good city government clubs. This movement may possibly result in the downfall of Tammany. The revolutions in Brooklyn and Gravesend are full of hope for reform. Boss McKane has gone to Sing Sing, leaving as a legacy a deficit, it is said, of \$200,000 in the public moneys. The enormous direct and indirect losses which cities sustain through the public stealings and inefficiencies of bosses and machines, of contractors and an attendant army of small politicians, can be read in the history of New York, not only under Boss Tweed, but under Boss Croker, and in the recent history of Philadelphia and of Baltimore. Tweed and his ring stole their millions of city money until finally, under the leadership of the *New York Times* and a comparatively small number of courageous and influential citizens, these gigantic wrongdoings were exposed, the ring broken up, Tweed driven into exile and finally to prison, where he died in poverty and humiliation. But the citizens of New York were mistaken when they thought that reform by spasms would cure the evil. Nothing will cure the evil but a permanent organization in the community of the forces for good, which will take the city government into its own hands. There will be no permanent municipal reform until there is a permanent municipal party which will elect men to city offices without considering their political views, but asking only whether they are honest and capable. Boss Croker, of New York, a man who has for years from the depths of Tammany Hall controlled New York city with a rod of iron, and who could turn or refuse to turn the key of legislation at Albany, a man who has had no visible means

of support, is now reputed a millionaire, and buys fast horses costing \$30,000 and \$40,000 apiece.

Tammany's systematic bleeding alike of places of evil resort and of honest business to support the organization is well known. It has been thoroughly exposed by Dr. Parkhurst and others. It is very gratifying to our Republican partisanship to note these sins of a Democratic machine. But in Philadelphia, at least, we have just as dangerous derelictions under a Republican machine, for the political name which he assumes changes neither the motives nor the methods of a dishonest man. It is quite plain that a party which under all ordinary conditions can count on a large majority rapidly becomes corrupt. Its worst men gain control through dishonest methods and keep it in the same way. Emboldened by popular indifference, the machine becomes more and more confident, until some especially audacious crime alarms the community and leads to a revolt which temporarily drives it from power. But the popular memory is short, and the absence of any definite organized channel through which reform sentiment can express itself prevents continuous good results. Important reforms were effected in Philadelphia through the operations of the Committee of One Hundred. The Gas Ring was broken up, a reform mayor was elected, and, for a time, it looked as though permanent and complete reform would be effected in Philadelphia. But it was not so. A reform committee aroused the jealousy of the mass of voters. Members of the committee were charged with personal ambitions; but what chiefly brought about its dissolution was partisan prejudice, which resented the advancement of men who happened to be Democrats in national politics to places of trust and emolument. Political partisanship is more than any other thing the bane of good city government, for it presents a wholly false issue and divides citizens who really desire the well-being of the municipality into two hostile armies perpetually at war with one another. Doubtless the machine boss grins in secret, and is tempted to exclaim, "What fools these mortals be!" when he sees that a transparent device will lead the community by the nose to its own great loss, for it is the pocket of the voter

which must meet the heavy cost of official stealings and the wasteful extravagance which, in a hundred ways, is the outcome of partisan boss rule. It was the people's pockets which met the loss of more than \$1,000,000 following the Bardsley defalcation in Philadelphia. It is surprising to how small a degree the popular mind avails itself of such an experience. But it has not yet learned to do so. There is every reason to believe that some of Bardsley's predecessors in the city treasurer's office had used the public moneys in their private business transactions, but that they did it successfully and were able to return the sums taken, while Bardsley did it unsuccessfully and went to jail in consequence. The books of a number of his predecessors, when Mr. W. Redwood Wright took that office temporarily through the appointment of Governor Pattison, were diligently sought, but could nowhere be found. Nor was any satisfactory excuse for their non-appearance ever given.

The stronghold of corruption in Philadelphia to-day is that alliance, which we are forced to believe exists, between machine leaders and a majority of the city councils on the one side, and corporate wealth unscrupulously used on the other. It has been estimated by a careful and conservative student of the relations existing between street-car railways and the city—Mr. Charles Richardson—that had the profits of these companies been limited to eight per cent per annum during the last twenty years, and the surplus paid into the city treasury, Philadelphia, by proper management, would have been between \$75,000,000 and \$100,000,000 richer than she is to-day. But the bargains between the corporations and the city have never been conducted on that business basis on which rest the dealings of two evenly matched business men, or the city never would have permitted itself to be the victim of such enormous imposition. It is astonishing that the taxpayers ever submitted to such losses without seeking an effective remedy. But the true idea of what the modern city is and what it is destined to become has no more than dawned upon our people. No one who has given even the most superficial attention to the management of public affairs in Philadelphia during the last few years can doubt that

corrupt means are employed in order to influence the legislation of councils. One has only to visit Council Chamber upon any occasion when legislation affecting some great railroad or street-car company is under consideration to have that belief deepen into certainty, when he sees the lobbyist of a great corporation openly directing the course of legislation, and when he sees all amendments in the interest of the public voted down without serious consideration. It is fully believed by those who have given careful consideration to the subject that a majority of our councilmen can be influenced by corrupt means. That city is in a dangerous state whose purse strings are in the hands of forces alien to her interests. The machine influence is systematically built up and maintained by corporate interests for purely business reasons. A partisanship so blind and intense that it can tolerate such abuses is naturally encouraged by those who find it a most effectual shield to their schemes for public plunder. The maintenance of extreme partisanship is the first object of the machine. For the political partisan will sacrifice every moral consideration to his party prejudices. Springfield, Mass., furnishes a fair illustration of good city government sustained through a series of years by ignoring national party lines in municipal affairs; Asheville, North Carolina, of a town where public-spirited Democrats have made a successful start in the same direction.

The withering influence of the machine upon education is similar to that which it exerts upon public spirit. The question of the efficiency of the teaching force must be subordinated to political interests, to considerations which are quite foreign to the great purpose for which the public school system was instituted, namely, the highest welfare of the children under its care.

Now, what is the remedy for this dishonest and inefficient government of cities, of which I have given illustrations? I believe the remedy will be found, first in the organization of a municipal league in all our great cities, which will have as its object the concentration of all forces for good in one permanent ever-working body, a body which will in time become a municipal party. Second, such an organization aims at

the destruction of partisanship in city affairs, so that men shall discontinue the fatal practice of voting in municipal matters as though upon national issues. Just so soon as this simple and effective method is adopted, the disintegration of the party machine will have begun. Of course, this change cannot be made immediately, but only after a long and steady process of education. Third, the civil service reform spirit must come to pervade municipal management before efficient service can be hoped for among city employees. Merit, not party service must be the means by which employment in the civil service of the city is secured. When the machine can no longer give out office as party spoils, it will be largely robbed of its power for evil. Then the city will be managed in the interest of the taxpayers, not in the interest of a favored few. But at once the most important and most difficult work to be performed is the creation of that deep, conscientious sense of personal responsibility in the minds of good men and women without which the future will be as dark as the present. Until we see the looming moral proportions of this question, ease and personal comfort will bind all nobler aspirations with a silken thread. Overmuch prosperity has been to us "a draught of deadly wine." Perhaps we need to suffer more before we fully open our eyes to the ultimate consequences of our general toleration of public dishonesty.

Many and important interests depend upon the good government of our cities, the efficiency of our public schools, the proper management of our public institutions, the maintenance of various public privileges and advantages, parks, public libraries, etc. The comfort of the rich is involved, but far more largely the comfort of the poor. A badly governed city affects most seriously the poor, for they feel advanced taxation most quickly and are most dependent upon the pleasures and privileges which a well administered city affords.

But also let us not forget that upon the character of the city administration largely depends the dignity, honor, and wisdom of our national character and our national politics. The machine government of our cities has, of late years, made

conspicuously felt in the lowered tone of the Senate of the United States. New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, by their representation in that once imposing and dignified body, give force to this statement. National patriotism, as well as a desire for local well-being, should stimulate us to undertake this reform. It can only be effected by the patient, intelligent, self-sacrificing efforts of the best men and women in our great cities. But there is no line of effort which will more richly repay expenditure, which will bring in a more varied and important harvest of results.

HERBERT WELSH.

THE LAWYER FROM A MORAL STANDPOINT.

BY J. FLETCHER DENNIS.

IN AN article in THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS, for March, entitled "The Lawyer as a Public Servant," I suggested, but did not discuss at length, the ethical phase of the lawyer's duties, and quoted the words of Aristotle declaring that "the laws constitute the principal and most important branch of ethics; they are, in fact, the application of morality to the various matters that arise in daily life." Since Aristotle's day, however, the world has very largely fallen into the habit of jesting over the alleged dishonesty of lawyers, and of twisting the first syllable of the word until it has the vowel sound of long "i."

Who has not heard the oft-quoted epitaph,

"Here lieth one, believe it if you can,
Who, though a lawyer, was an honest man;
The gates of Heaven to him are opened wide,
But closed, alas! to all his tribe beside."

or the invitation of the janitor who was displaying to a number of lawyers the conveniences of a newly built courthouse soon to be occupied,

"Come, sinners, round and view the ground,
Where you shall shortly lie."

or the really excellent story of the Irishman (these witty things in print are always said by Irishmen) who, seeing on a gravestone the legend, "Here lies a lawyer and an honest man," claimed in evident perplexity, "What the divil made thim the two av thim in the wan grave?"

From Prescott's "Conquest of Peru" (Volume 1, p. 304), we learn that in the famous "Capitulation" of July 26, 1529, between Pizarro and the queen, "It was expressly enjoined Pizarro . . . to carry out with him a specified number

ecclesiastics with whom he was to take counsel in the conquest of the country and whose efforts were to be dedicated to the service and conversion of the Indians; while lawyers and attorneys on the other hand, whose presence was considered as boding ill to the harmony of the settlements, were strictly prohibited from setting foot in them."

There is a French proverb that "a good lawyer is always a bad neighbor," because, presumably, he is "considered as boding ill to the harmony of the settlement." This view is not, however, often taken seriously in the present day. A *bad* lawyer is still, no doubt, always a bad neighbor, but to be a great lawyer one must be a great and good man. His moral standpoint cannot be too high, for his duty calls him into all the shifting scenes of life, where honor is most needed and where dishonesty can most easily be concealed. The man of business entangled in a net and harassed by his debts must seek a lawyer's aid, and must sometimes give himself entirely into his counsel's keeping.

It is said that a man will give something to save his soul, will give much to save his life, but will give anything to save his property; and by so much as this is true does the lawyer, more than the clergyman or the physician, keep the conscience of his client. The lawyer hears his secrets and reads his inmost thought, and the law itself forbids him to betray the knowledge thus obtained. He is sought by the widow and the orphan; he stands between the helpless or the timid and those who would oppress them. When the culprit stands before the bar of earthly justice, the *lawyer* steadies the hand that holds the scales. Bill Nye once referred to Hon. George R. Peck, the learned railroad attorney, as "the man who stands between the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fé Railroad and substantial justice," thus turning a happy witticism into a very pretty compliment. The *lawyer's* duty is something very different from that. The man employed to defeat the ends of justice is known by another name; we call him *pettifogger*.

Not only in the active scenes of life is the lawyer a participant, but when the sands run low he is called, with confidence,

to commit to legal form the last mortal wish of the departing—to preserve his earthly possessions to the objects of his affection. And if the sojourner go beyond, leaving no written expression of his will, he leaves to law and lawyers the disposition of his estate. More solemn responsibilities than these are not, and truly the law “employs, in its theory, the noblest faculties of the soul, and exerts, in its practice, the cardinal virtues of the heart.”

History is not devoid of noble instances of such faithfulness to duty. A father, in a moment of passion, disinherited his only daughter, and bequeathed his large property to his attorney and two other cherished friends. The lawyer summoned his colleagues and persuaded them to join with him in conveying to the needy and deserving daughter the entire property thus obtained. When his unselfish course was known and made the subject of public comment and praise, he sought to minimize his claim to exceptional credit by showing that the legacy received was not quite so large as had been represented. Such examples are rare, no doubt; they are, maybe, “too bright and good for human nature’s daily food,” but no standard of morality is too high to strive for, even though we often fail.

In his capacity as counselor, the lawyer’s moral obligation is very prominent. Litigation is an evil. To prevent litigation is often the lawyer’s highest duty and most useful function. A client often seeks a lawyer with feelings roused to a pitch of indignation that blinds his eyes to justice, and precludes discriminating judgment. Trifling wrongs are magnified to mountains of oppression, until, not justice, but revenge, must satisfy the sentiment. Let the lawyer then be calm and temper undue zeal; both parties may be honest, and offensive operations must be avoided. To gratify hatred, malice, or revenge, is not within the province, and failing here to reach the proper plane, he brings the profession into disrepute and gives his fellows over to public reprobation, as the instigators of quarrels, “who never enter a suit but always prime a suit, to make it bear the greater store of fruit,” and gives color to the charge that

“As laboring men their hands, criers their lungs,
Porters their backs, so lawyers hire their tongues.”

It has been said that the administration of justice should be cheap, and some inveigh against the courts because of the expensiveness of litigation, but this seeming fault is not without its benefits. Lawyers' fees have never been so high as to reduce the number of lawsuits to those brought of absolute necessity. Much needless litigation has always been the rule. If the cost were reduced, no doubt the grievances seeking public redress would indefinitely increase. Trivial matters easily settled by the timely application of a little equine intelligence and discretion, would find their way into the courts to the disadvantage of both parties. And while lawyers' heavy fees act as a wholesome preventive of petty lawsuits, they are not less potent in securing for the profession the higher order of talent which its proper pursuit so urgently demands.

The lawyer's domain is reason, not the passions; let him be "a light to eyes blinded by hatred to their own interests." The prospective client is entitled to a candid opinion as to the merits of his case and as to the best course to be pursued, and such opinion he should receive even though it does not suit his fancy. Equity favors the compromise of doubtful claims. The law's sharp weapons should not be needlessly resorted to, and should seldom be directed against those who are more unfortunate than culpable. Others' rights are dear to them, and as just perhaps as are your client's. Lord Macaulay has well said that "scarcely any quarrel ever happens in which the right and wrong are so exquisitely balanced that all the right lies on one side, and all the wrong on the other." It would be most wholesome to keep this fact constantly before the mind, for, to quote Lord Bolingbroke, "the profession of the law, in its nature the noblest and most beneficial to mankind, is in its abuse and abasement the most sordid and pernicious."

In a state of barbarism every man's hand is against his neighbor, and personal advantage sets the only limit to his privileges and his duties. With the first gleam of civilization these privileges are circumscribed by his duty toward others, from which no individual is entirely free. In such a society, what then may a lawyer do in behalf of his client without in-

fringing his duty to the public, and without regard to the inherent justice of his cause?

This is a question oft mooted both by the profession and the laity, and the extremes are wide apart. Memorable on the one hand are Lord Brougham's hot words uttered in the defense of Queen Caroline, the unhappy wife of George IV.:

An advocate in the discharge of his duty knows but one person, and that person is his client. To save his client by all means and expedients and at all hazards and costs to other persons—and among them himself—is his first and only duty; and in performing that duty he must not regard the alarms, the torments, the destruction he may bring upon others. Separating the duty of the patriot from that of advocate, he must go on reckless of consequences, though it should be his unhappy lot to involve his country in confusion.

These words show zeal, but not discretion; they are commanding, but not convincing. All society is founded on the theory, at least, of the greatest good to the greatest number, and such a code as this is utterly subversive of this fundamental principle. In criminal trials especially, too often the prosecution seeks to secure a conviction by any means, and the defense we may assume usually stops at nothing to escape the penalty of wrongdoing. If the public be aroused to participation and clamor in favor of one or the other, the advocate may find himself unduly swerved and may seek to gratify such public sentiment to the detriment of public justice. Cases involving the freedom or the life of the accused demand in the lawyer a far-seeing discrimination and an all-inclusive view. He may be required to face the indignation of a frowning but unthinking community, and to maintain his integrity at the sacrifice of popularity or ambitions. On the other hand, his recreance duty may entail the most unfortunate results. A crime is committed which justly outrages public sentiment, and through sharp practice or corrupt methods the perpetrator goes unpunished; his freedom from restraint, even his existence, involves the peace-loving portion of the community in constant apprehension; then indignation bursts all bounds; the law's lays and loopholes are made the excuse for defiance of all

and property and life pay the penalty for one man's overzeal in behalf of a worthless client.

Opposite to Lord Brougham's position is that of Sir Matthew Hale, who, in his early practice, would never accept a seemingly unjust cause. But, in after life, he was convinced that in this he had in a measure erred, for he felt that no one can so thoroughly know a case as to be entitled to a final opinion on its merits until all the facts are thoroughly presented.

In every life, questions of moral duty arise for daily settlement; paths constantly diverge, and the safe one must hourly and anew be chosen. There is no universal standard; each conscience must settle some things for itself, unaided but by an enlightened understanding.

One thing, positively, however, a lawyer may never do for his client what the common conscience of mankind would forbid that client to do for himself. He may not espouse the cause of one who seeks to perpetrate a wrong through some chance advantage the law may happen to afford him. But not often, if ever, need a lawyer decline to undertake the defense of the accused. To undertake his defense, however, is not to decide to make every conceivable effort to save him from conviction; that might include, at last resort, the purchase of perjured testimony in his behalf, which even the most hardened might resort to, but would hardly seek to justify.

But to secure to him those advantages and safeguards which the law, in mercy, offers him, is permissible and just. If more than this be expected or required, but one honest course is open; to decline peremptorily the proffered employment and forego the longed-for fee. Honest men decline opportunities for dishonest gain in every walk in life. However, by declining to espouse a cause because there seems to be ground for believing the party guilty, the lawyer would usurp the function of both judge and jury. The courts appoint attorneys for accused persons in extremity, and, where the issue is life or death, counsel thus appointed cannot refuse the trust, so jealous is the law of the security of its subjects, and so averse to judgment against any one unheard.

Sydney Smith justifies the acceptance of any ordinary case that offers, on the ground that truth is best arrived at by the earnest efforts of opposing advocates, and this proposition is no doubt true enough if the contestants use only legitimate weapons.

What better statement of the proper view of this much-debated question than that of Sir William Blackstone, the law student's patron saint?

"To virtue and her friends a friend,
Still may my voice the weak defend.
Ne'er may my prostituted tongue
Protect the oppressor in his wrong,
Nor wrest the spirit of the laws
To sanctify the villain's cause."

Sharp practice, then, is no part of the lawyer's duty, nor a client's wishes or instructions afford an excuse for unnecessary or unjust delay, and this view is held by the courts themselves. Chief Justice Holt said that an attorney who falsely delays justice is guilty of breaking his official oath. Cunning and trickery, snappish advantage taken of the mistakes and slips of others, will breed distrust among his fellows of the bar, and inevitably reduce his influence and effectiveness, while at the same time he sullies the fair fame of the profession in the eyes of the watchful public.

An advocate may not withdraw from a case on the appearance of damning testimony against his client. An intensely interesting illustration of the problem thus involved arose in England, in 1840, in the defense of a murderer named Courvoisier by Mr. Charles Phillips, a distinguished London lawyer. A wealthy and aged man had been murdered in his bed; three servants were the only other persons known to have been in the house at the time. One of these, Courvoissier, was indicted, and was represented by Mr. Phillips, who defended him with wonted energy inspired by a firm conviction that he was innocent. On a second trial, Courvoissier was found guilty, and afterwards developed that during the progress of this second trial, in terror at the production of some new and damaging evidence, he had confessed his guilt to his attorney, and begged him, frantically, to save his life, and Mr. Phillips had ca-

the case to its conclusion, bearing this secret in his bosom. He was publicly and privately assailed for what was called his dishonorable course in the matter, and his conduct was condemned by many, some of whom were misled, however, by the false charge of his accusers, that he had used every effort to fasten suspicion upon his client's fellow-servants. Fortunately, for the good name of the profession, he was induced, after many years, to unseal his lips, which he had closed in scorn, resulting in a complete vindication of his course. It was then made to appear that the confession was made to him in the presence of one other man; that after torturing doubts and sleepless nights, Mr. Phillips had sought the counsel of a member of the bench not concerned in the case on trial, and on his advice had continued in the case, narrowly watched by these two men who had full knowledge of the facts, and who now averred that they had utterly failed to find one word uttered by him not consonant with strict integrity and truth. Added to this conclusive vindication, the verbatim reports in the daily press of his closing argument, bore witness in the light of these additional facts to the rigid honesty and discriminating conscientiousness of this noble man who dared to do his duty while all his world in ignorance condemned him.

We sometimes dare to praise the warrior who rides against the cannon's mouth to meet a certain death, as did those at Balaklava, or the followers of Gonzales, whom he so cheerfully assured, "I lead ye not to win a field, I lead ye forth to die." Their horses sought the fray as eagerly and with about the same discretion, but it was something a little less than courage that animated them. Pride, or recklessness, or hunger for posthumous fame may prompt such deeds as these, but when a lofty soul, to shield a fellow-man, with only conscience to approve, can face the world's disfavor and jeopardize the affection and esteem of his most valued friends, he then, for once, reveals the image of his Maker.

T. FLETCHER DENNIS.

THE PANIC AND THE SILVER MOVEMENT.

BY A. B. AND H. FARQUHAR.

IN THE presence of a great and general calamity such as foreign war, a domestic insurrection, or a commercial crisis due to the forces of human association and not those of a chained nature, no thought is more natural than that this disaster could have been prevented. It was brought about, we say, by thinking beings, and a little more thought could have warded it off. Comparing the lamentable ills from which the country is suffering with any possible good that could have been found in the acts which precipitated them, our indignation at those acts whatever we may believe them to have been—invariably rises, and we lament the stiff-necked perversity in which they have found their source. Such is the general course of thought; such views, in one shape or another, have been held and uttered by all who have considered the crisis of 1893-4; and such is doubtless the explanation of articles like that entitled "An Artificial Panic in Retrospect," in the June JOURNAL OF POLITICS.

If this natural tendency of the thinking mind could be checked by anything, it would be by observing that the unanimity with which the disaster was voted to have been prevented does not survive a discussion of the means that should have been taken to prevent it. Inquirers are of one opinion in fastening the blame on the folly of human act and the blindness of human discernment; but when it comes to specifying what was foolish and what men were short-sighted, there are as many opinions as inquiries. It may easily be shown that the war or business crush might have been escaped if this set of men had yielded the right amount, at the right time, but as long as the same thing may be as easily shown for that set of men, and the other set, we cannot fasten the responsibility

tainly and individually upon any. Thus it might be possible to agree with Mr. Knapp that his "associated banks" and "gold syndicate" and what not, could have postponed the panic of last summer by conducting their business differently, and yet be no less unwilling to hold them solely accountable for a calamity which could have been altogether avoided if people had otherwise performed their part. But, as will be seen, Mr. Knapp hardly makes even a plausible case against the men he denounces, so that this slight measure of approval is all too liberal for his essay.

Not that there are not some true things in this "Artificial Panic" paper. The writer is justified in claiming that a strong specie reserve, like that of France, has its advantages. To be sure, a third of the French per capita currency, consisting of silver stored in bank vaults, has no monetary function whatever, and the country might practically as well be without it; but the gold reserves of that country, added to its coin in actual circulation, undoubtedly give it exceptional strength. But the important point here to consider is that this exceptional strength is purchased at exceptional cost. The French hold more money than the English or our own countrymen, because they need more to accomplish the same amount of business. They get nothing like the same amount of work out of their 25 francs than the English do out of their pound sterling or we out of \$5. A country cannot do business in the English way, or in our own way, and at the same time keep a per capita circulation on the French scale, because the laws of supply and demand do not permit it. Coin is value in a highly mobile form, and it invariably glides away in the direction where the demand for it is strongest. Unquestionably we sometimes suffer inconvenience from our habit of getting more work out of the same sum of money than the French do; but until our business men can be persuaded to give up this habit, the attempt to supply our country with a currency of \$50, or even \$30 per capita, of real money, will necessarily fail.

But if we have to admit the truth of a conclusion, here and there, in Mr. Knapp's paper, we must be equally prepared to

encounter a total lack of truth elsewhere; for there seems to be no other way to characterize the monstrous assertion that "we have refunded our war debt in the interest of national banks, until it will now take much more labor to pay what remains than it would have done to settle the whole when it was first contracted." Our war debt is now a little over a third of what it was when first contracted, while the cost of labor, instead of falling to one third of its former figures, has actually risen. Statements of this kind are often based on the fall in price of agricultural staples. The country now produces double as much, in amount, as it did twenty years ago, while the increase in value is very much smaller—approximately stated, about one fourth. But it is absurd to estimate the labor cost of our doubled crops at double that of the crops of 1870; the fall in price is due far more to economy in the application of labor than to any appreciation in the standard of value, if indeed the latter factor is perceptible at all.

Very little higher estimate can be put upon several other assertions, as that about the coinage job of 1878, as having "been the only cause of the measure of good times we have had since," or that about exports of gold as "most foolishly charged to continue silver purchases"—as though it were foolish to see that the effort to set up an artificially higher price for one of the country's products, must inevitably result in curtailing our export of that product, and thus increase our export of some other. Points like these may be noted perhaps, as specimens of the article we are examining; they hardly need an elaborate refutation.

It seems worth while to vindicate the president from the charges made against him by Mr. Knapp, that he conspired "treacherously overthrow silver," when he first sought to have the bullion purchase clause repealed, that the gold exports on which he supported his subsequent efforts to the same end were "artificially" brought about, and that he gave his party friends to understand, as a condition of their coöperation in those efforts that he was willing to do something handsome by silver "at the general session in December." It would be impossible to prove that nobody in the country, during the campaign of 1892, m

understood Mr. Cleveland's position on the coinage question ; but it is difficult to believe that anyone in Colorado could have entertained any doubt. The greater part of the Democratic party in that state bolted the presidential ticket that year, precisely because the candidate would not make the professions that Mr. Knapp now insinuates that he did make. Secondly, there is no evidence of conspiracy in the gold exportations, even in the words quoted from Mr. Clews—"more gold was shipped than Europe required," etc. Markets had often been glutted before without conspiracies, and the same thing doubtless occurred then. Finally, no promise that "silver would be satisfactorily recognized" can be traced to President Cleveland, and it is safe to say that if the recognition was to take any form in which the solvency of the national treasury should be in the least endangered, he made no such promise. Votes to sustain the administration on a point so vital to it, cast by loyal Democratic representatives and senators, needed no entangling promise to explain them.

On page 660, Mr. Knapp makes the astounding declaration that "the proof that this panic was most unnatural and criminal, appears from an order issued by the management of the associated system to all national banks to secure concerted action," etc., etc. He goes on to quote from this circular, dated March 12th, 1893. Now, since there is no such "associated system," no such circular was issued, nor was it received by "all national banks," or any of them, so far as we can learn; nor would it have merited the slightest attention had it been received. If not criminally careless in his statements, Mr. Knapp is the victim of a hoax.

It is assuredly a singular result of the singular "order issued by the management of the associated system to all national banks," for the purpose of securing "the future life of national banks as fixed and safe investments," which Mr. Knapp quotes (not literally, however, but "substantially") as proof of flagitious "purpose," that thereupon "bank and other failures commenced by the wholesale." Was it part of the banks' conspiracy to bring disaster upon themselves? Or were the banks that

were forced to fail used as cat's-paws? And, if so, how and how much have any other national banks gained by their losses? The great gain alleged to be in store for the national banks from "an artificial panic," is found in the issue of more bonds: "they demand an immense national debt to perpetuate their existence." On the contrary, they demand no such thing. Their circulation, of course, depends on the national debt, as the law now stands; but the issue of circulating notes is not the whole "existence" of banks, nor even the most important part of it. The motive alleged for this order appears, therefore, so insufficient as to be even absurd.

One of the grievances from which this writer suffers is "clearing-house gold certificates—for circulation among the banks only," and an accompanying repletion of money in the banks, along with scarcity "among the great mass of the people." We cannot deny that such things do happen, nor undertake to maintain that the banks have earned the partial favors of fortune by greater patriotism, or greater virtue of any kind. But why will people be so blind to the real lesson of their own facts? Money goes to the banks because the banks have credit, and away from the great mass because the great mass are unfortunately without it. Where the credit is, there shall the money be also. There was a time, last summer, when the credit of the banks was impaired; then the money left them, and they were sorely straitened for lack of it. Again, it is gold, pray observe, that piles up in the banks. To people like our writer, this fact is proof that a great corner in gold is preparing, the volume of that metal being insufficient for monetary uses—but that is all moonshine. People who have to hold a reserve will always choose the best money for it—money, that is to say, which is certain not to depreciate on their hands. They choose gold in this country, only because they do not feel absolutely assured that the gold dollar and the silver and currency dollar may not at some time part company. Who would not rather hold the paper of a house whose solvency is unquestioned, than of one upon which the very smallest atom of doubt rested?

We are treated in this paper to a totally new economic principle; that a gold basis "necessitates debt; for under it there is an insufficient supply of money to carry on business and development, which must be done by borrowing." Further along

we find: "The recent moves made to bring the United States, Austria-Hungary, and India to a permanent gold basis, will make it more difficult for us to maintain gold payments in the future, and compel the frequent addition to our debt for that purpose." The value of a proposed principle of this kind can best be tested by inquiring where we would be without it, what we could do by the light of our unassisted knowledge. If Knapp had not spoken, we would probably say that the increase or decrease of our debt depended on the relation of the two quantities, revenue and expenditure, and was not affected in the remotest degree by the kind of unit in which those quantities were reckoned; that by imposing sufficient taxes and observing proper economy, we could reduce and finally discharge our public debt, whether we called it gold or called it silver; and *vice versa*. And now, if Mr. Knapp will permit us, we shall continue to say so. This supposed discovery is, in point of plain fact, nonsense.

A plea for "the restoration of our ancient and constitutional right to free and unlimited coinage of silver by the people" ends the story. That will be cheerfully granted, under either of two conditions. First, supposing the right in question to have been taken away about 1873, we observe that the largest coinage of silver in any year previous (we have to be particular, for the coinage at once increased after the right to coin was cut off) was only \$9,000,000 of all denominations. The first suggested condition is that the coinage in any one year shall not exceed \$9,000,000. Secondly, if that be refused, and the limit be left blank, we only ask that the silver so coined shall not be used to pay obligations incurred in gold or its equivalent. In other words, have all the silver you want, on the simple condition of not using it in swindling other people.

What is the true explanation of the panic? There were two panics, the first brought about by distrust of the country's ability to maintain all its currency equal to gold, in the face of a rapidly depleting stock of gold in the treasury, on which alone the parity depended; the second, a sort of travesty of the other, a distrust of investments generally because investments depending on the maintenance of gold payments had grown doubtful. The second panic may have been unavoidable, but it was none the less unreasonable.

A. B. AND H. FARQUHAR.

THE OUTLOOK.

[*Notes and comments concerning affairs of interest to intelligent and patriotic citizens. Address communications for this department to Outlook Department, American Journal of Politics, 114 Nassau Street, New York City.*]

ADVANTAGES OF "THE OUTLOOK."—With every month matters of interest present themselves which cannot be discussed in the form of articles, but concerning which timely and valuable information may be given in the way of notes and comments. This is one of the purposes of this department; but its larger purpose is to make THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS more useful in furthering the objects to which it has always been devoted, and in promoting which it will hereafter have the valuable coöperation of the American Institute of Civics.

There will be opportunity for the free interchange of tersely expressed thoughts upon all pertinent questions, and every reader is asked to regard these pages as a forum always open for utterances relating to affairs in the field of civics, and this field is to be considered as including all that concerns the highest interests of a self-governing people, from the unit which is the home of one family to the nation which is the home of all.

THE JOURNAL, in this department, will not only record the progress of the work directed by the Institute, and be a medium through which it may especially speak to its members and the general public; it will also afford opportunity for summary statements concerning the progress of all organizations and movements which have for their object the promotion of the same high interests. It will thus aid in realizing one of the chief aims of the Institute, which is, without interference in the matter of specific methods, to promote the intelligent patriotism, the civic virtue, and the practical unity in action, which shall give increased power to the citizens and organizations of citizens, whose sympathies and activities are unselfishly directed to the accomplishment of the great end of realizing and maintaining good government through good citizenship.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CIVICS.—Information as to the objects of this noble institution is elsewhere presented, but it may here be briefly said that they are "to promote everywhere, and through all practical agencies, including home influences, educational institutions, the press, and the platform, the integrity, intelligence, patriotism, and vigilance which are essential to the commonweal under the rule of the people." The Institute, in the nine years since its formation, as evidenced by an influence everywhere felt, has been a consistent and powerful exponent of the worthy aims which it represents. As expressed in t

Institute's articles of incorporation,* these purposes are "To promote, without reference to the inculcation of special theories or partisan views, a patient and conscientious study of the most essential facts relating to affairs of citizenship and government, to the end that every citizen may be qualified to act the part of an intelligent and upright juror in all affairs submitted to the decision of the ballot." What the Institute has done in furtherance of this aim through its occasional publications, and with a serious drain upon its resources, will continue to be done, and under its auspices; but in such manner as to secure a large saving in expenditures in its press department, and a corresponding advantage to its other departments. While the distribution of literature thus secured will be the same in kind, it will be far larger in extent; and its presentation in a magazine, which aims to occupy a foremost place among periodicals of its kind, and through which the Institute may speak to its readers and the public monthly, will be attended by so many advantages that the members of the Institute, not less than the former readers of THE JOURNAL, have reason to give the new arrangement their cordial approval.

ALLIANCE OF THE JOURNAL AND THE INSTITUTE.—The arrangement by which THE JOURNAL becomes associated with the Institute, therefore represents an alliance of forces directed to the accomplishment of common purposes. Conducted by the same publishers and the same editor-in-chief, THE JOURNAL will undergo no changes other than those resulting from valuable additions to its editorial staff and corps of contributors. It will have even a higher standard of excellence, and the larger usefulness attendant upon an increased circulation. This alliance will therefore make the magazine not less, but more valuable to its former readers. Its new readers, the worthy citizens by whose unselfish coöperation the Institute of Civics has been placed "in the forefront in a great patriotic movement that nothing can prevent from going forward,"† will find it, as the spokesman of the press department of their honored institution, an exponent of the same purposes which have inspired the publications (equivalent to more than 16,000,000 octavo pages) sent forth at different times and in different forms through that department.

With a degree of success indicated by the unqualified commendation of representative secular and religious journals of every shade of opinion, and a continually increasing circle of appreciative readers, THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS will use its every effort to promote "the integrity, intelligence, patriotism, and vigilance which are essential to the commonweal under the rule of the people."

WOMAN'S NEW OPPORTUNITY.—This is the title of a *brochure*‡ by Daniel Greenleaf Thompson, Esq., of the New York bar, and of the

* Prepared with the aid of, and with others signed by, the late Chief Justice Waite, of the United States Supreme Court, first president of the Institute's board of trustees.

† New York *Mail and Express*.

‡ Longmans, Green & Co., New York. 25c.

faculty of the Institute of Civics. It is the substance of a thoughtful and suggestive address delivered before the Woman's Law Class of the New York City University, and is full of sensible observations which all students may consider with profit.

HOW TO MAKE NEW YORK BETTER.—Under title of "How to Make New York a Better City,"* Mr. Charles F. Wingate, one of the New York councilors of the Institute of Civics, trenchantly discusses some of the vexed problems of municipal government. These are some of his observations: "What is needed is that the public demand a better state of things. We must get down to business and say what we want and then see that we get it. People are wearied of the talk of reform in general. What they want is reform in particular. Let us abandon declamation and shrieking. Let us first reform ourselves. If the public demand gold watches and Bibles, the politicians will supply the demand. If we endure dirty streets, crowded schools, and tenements, it is our own fault." As a sanitary engineer, Mr. Wingate gives special attention to "the accursed tenement system" of New York, and asks "How can we expect to elevate the masses without improving their sanitary surroundings?" "The tenement rookery assails the family which is the basis of the church and of society. It promotes vice, fosters crime, feeds the saloon and the hospital, and is the source of endless physical and moral evil. Here, at least, radical action is necessary no matter at what cost."

MUNICIPAL LEAGUES.—Municipal league organizations may be expected to multiply in the near future. In response to an inquiry addressed to the Institute of Civics, as to methods of organization, we commend the constitution and by-laws of the Boston Municipal League. One of the Institute's councilors, Hon. S. B. Capen, is president of the League, and by addressing him a copy can doubtless be obtained. In this connection the editors take occasion to say that they will be glad to respond in these pages to inquiries concerning organized efforts for the betterment of civic and social conditions, and invite from the promoters of such efforts information which may be useful, in the form of notes and comments, as to meetings, addresses, publications, or other means employed for the realization of their objects.

THE PEABODY AND SLATER FUNDS.—The public has a general knowledge of the work which is being accomplished through the agency of the Peabody and Slater funds, but it is to be doubted whether it adequately appreciates the full importance of its noble activities. "to teach the gospel of work"; "to dignify labor"; "to prepare teachers and leaders for the negro race"; "to fit the negroes for the proper discharge of personal, social, political, and moral duties"; "to make them intelligent, upright, and industrious men, and good

*"Christian City" publications, 150 Fifth Ave., New York. 3c a copy.

zens"; these are various statements of the objects which these funds are promoting.

The magnitude of the field of endeavor is suggested by the fact that it includes "seven millions of negroes scattered over 818,000 square miles—as large a territory as Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Great Britain, Denmark, and Switzerland." All that this grand agency seeks to accomplish, with a right understanding of the term, is embraced within the scope of "Civics"; for the end of the work to which the Peabody and Slater funds contribute, is the reinforcement of the influences which make for good government, by making good citizens. Reports relating to this work, and which furnish information of great interest and value, can be secured by addressing the secretary of the funds, who is also a trustee of the Institute of Civics, Hon. J. L. M. Curry, LL.D., Washington, D. C.

POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY.—The June number of *The Political Science Quarterly*, Ginn & Co., Boston, has, among other exhaustive and scholarly articles, papers by Rowland Hazard (of the Institute of Civics) and Charles B. Spahr on "Giffen's Case against Bimetallism," and on "The Origin of Standing Committees" by Prof. J. F. Jameson.

. . . The Dallas (Texas) *Morning News*, of May 31, publishes in full an able and inspiring address on "Good Citizenship," delivered before the Texas State Union of Christian Endeavor societies at Waco, May 30, by one of the most interested of the Texas councilors of the Institute of Civics, Ira H. Evans, Esq., of Austin. Mr. Evans commended his hearers to cooperate in the work of the Institute, and response has been made by letters from all parts of Texas. . . . The Chicago members of the Institute have effected a large organization (The Chicago Civics Club), which includes many of the foremost citizens, with Judge E. B. Shoeman, LL.D., as president, Rev. Dr. E. O. Murray, vice-president, and E. M. Winston, Esq., secretary. The Chicago papers gave extended accounts of the organization and of the objects and work of the Institute.

ANNUAL MEETING OF TRUSTEES.—The annual meeting of the Board of Trustees of the American Institute of Civics, the ninth since its organization, and the seventh since its incorporation under the laws of Congress as a national institution, was held at the Ebbitt House, Washington, D. C., Wednesday, May 23, with an adjourned session at the Institute's offices in New York City, Thursday, June 7th. Hon. William Strong, LL. D., of the United States Supreme Court (retired), presided at the session in Washington, and Mr. John I. Covington, at the session in New York. The minutes of the proceedings of the executive committee of the board, which presented evidence of a large amount of useful labor, were presented, and its acts unanimously approved. The committee's efforts to make the Institute instrumental in enlisting societies of Christian Endeavor, Epworth League societies, and various women's organizations in activities calculated to promote the

objects represented by the Institute, were especially commended. Mr. Henry Fitch Blount suggested that steps be taken to secure the cooperation of the Federation of Women's Clubs, this being in the judgment an end greatly to be desired. Henry Randall Waite, president of the Institute, presented a printed copy of his annual report for the past year, with statements as to matters not referred to in the report, including arrangements with the publishers of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS, as the result of which that magazine will hereafter be the official organ of the Institute. Trustees to fill vacancies were elected as follows: Class of 1897, reelected: President William Preston Johnson, of Tulane University, New Orleans; Chancellor Henry M. MacCracken, New York City University; Cephas Brainerd, New York City; Dr. George Brown Goode, Director Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.; W. W. Scarborough, Cincinnati, O.; Henry Fitch Blount, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Henry Randall Waite, Brooklyn, N. Y.; and Gen. W. S. Stryker, Trenton, N. J. New elections: Hon. J. M. Curry, LL. D., Washington, D. C.; Dr. Cornelius N. Hoagland, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Gen. Joseph Cabell Breckinridge, U. S. Army, Washington, D. C. Class of 1896: Hon. Oswald Ottendorfer, of New York, to succeed Hon. Orlando B. Potter, deceased; Judge W. H. Arnoux, LL. D., of New York, to succeed Col. George T. Balch, deceased; and Col. Charles H. Denison, of New York. Class of 1895: Hon. E. B. Sherman, LL. D., of Chicago, Ill., to succeed Hon. John Jay, LL. D., deceased, and LaSalle A. Maynard, of New York. Officers of the board were elected as follows: Chairman, Justice William Strong, LL. D., U. S. Supreme Court; vice-chairman, Cephas Brainerd, Esq.; secretary, Hon. William E. Sheldon, LL. D.; treasurer, Col. Charles H. Denison; auditor, Dr. Cornelius N. Hoagland; executive committee, W. H. DePuy, LL. D., chairman; Judge W. H. Arnoux, Cephas Brainerd, J. I. Covington, Col. C. H. Denison, C. N. Hoagland, M. D., LaSalle A. Maynard, W. E. Sheldon, Dr. H. R. Waite. Andrew J. Palm, editor AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS, was elected secretary of the department of the press. Mr. Hughes D. Slater, secretary of the department of popular work, and John I. Covington, registrar. The following resolution was presented and unanimously adopted: "Resolved, That the executive committee, acting in conjunction with the Washington members of the board, be requested to consider the advisability of making provision for a general meeting of the members and friends of the Institute, to be held in Washington at some suitable time during the coming year, and that they be authorized and empowered to arrange for such a meeting. Through the unavoidable absence of the secretary of the board, George Brown Goode and LaSalle A. Maynard acted as secretaries at the respective sessions.

GOOD GOVERNMENT IN CITIES.—A conference of organizations interested in municipal government reform was held in New York last month, many large cities being represented by delegates. The speakers said that the outlook for reform was encouraging, as business

are beginning to realize the practical importance of the movement. The preamble to the constitution adopted for a Municipal League of New York State states the objects of the reformers to be as follows: "The administrative part of a city government should be conducted upon the same general principles as any large private business; general control of the business by those whose interests are involved; diligent and honest collection of revenue; economy in expenditure; appointment and promotion for merit alone, and without reference to the political faith of those employed; continuance in employment of those who give faithful and efficient service. Elective municipal offices should be filled by the best men qualified, of whatever political party; the questions which divide parties in state and nation do not concern the government of a city. Each city should have large authority and responsibility in the expenditure of moneys raised for municipal purposes."

THE TAXATION OF CHURCHES.—One of the mooted questions before the New York constitutional convention is the taxation of churches. The *New York Sun* notes the fact that the total value of church property in the state is \$140,123,008. These figures are from the census of 1890. According to the same census the total value of church property in the United States is \$639,694,439. Those who believe that church property should be taxed are not only interested in influencing the delegates to this convention, but they are busily at work promulgating their ideas in all other states. It is recalled to them that James A. Garfield once said: "If you exempt the property of any church organization, to that extent you impose a tax upon the whole community."

The *Sun* further says: The exemptionists argue that church property is non-productive, and for that reason should be exempt. The non-exemptionists, replying, say that a great deal of secular property is non-productive, and add: "But, as a matter of fact, are churches wholly unproductive? In many of them pews are rented at prices which put them out of the reach of all but the more wealthy people of the society, making these churches practically club rooms for the rich. Why should they not pay taxes on these luxurious appointments of worship? People who own club rooms in which they worship probably just as sincerely on week days as they and others do in the fashionable churches on Sunday must pay taxes on their places of resort, and there is no really sound reason why owners of the churches should have more favors than they. In another way the churches are productive. They are collection offices and workshops. In them are gathered most of the moneys which pay the salaries of 112,000 or more clergymen, and in them these clergymen do much of the work which entitles them to the pay. In the buildings owned by these corporations millions of dollars are annually raised by means of pew rentals, fairs, raffles, meals, collections, and subscriptions. How can they be exempt on the ground of non-productivity?"

The exemptionists say that churches exert a great moral influence and therefore they should not be taxed. The non-exemptionists attack this argument with more than ordinary vigor, and say: "Perhaps other 'argument' against justice in taxation has so much influence on the average man as this, and yet no defense of church pauperism could be weaker. What can be said for the moral influence of an organization which deliberately refuses to pay its just dues? Fundamental to all morality is justice. The man who will not deal justly with his fellows is not moral in any practical way. He may cry aloud for morality and decency and purity until he is exhausted, but if he systematically defrauds his neighbors or denies to them equality of opportunity he is dishonest. It is a hollow mockery to claim that the Church exerts a healthful moral influence, while she each year puts her hand into the pockets of the people and steals millions of dollars. She owns property, and she should pay the taxes upon it at the same rate that the individual citizen is assessed for his property."

A fine church enhances the value of adjacent property, it is contended, and therefore it is just to exempt them from taxation. The non-exemptionists quote from the Rev. Dr. Wayland, who, in his "Political Economy," says: "All that religious societies have a right to at the hands of the civil government is the same privileges for transacting their affairs which societies of every sort possess. This they have a right to demand, not because they are religious societies, but because the exercise of religion is an innocent mode of pursuing happiness. If it happens accidentally that others are benefited, it does not follow that they are obliged to pay for this benefit. It cannot be proved that the Christian religion needs the support of the civil government, since it has existed and flourished when entirely deprived of this support."

They also quote Benjamin Franklin, who wrote: "When a religion is good I conceive that it will support itself, and when it cannot support itself and God does not take care to support it, so its professors are obliged to call for help from the civil power, it is a sign, I apprehend, of its being a bad one."

Again, the non-exemptionists quote James A. Garfield, who said: "The divorce between Church and State ought to be absolute and ought to be so absolute that no church property anywhere, in any state or in any nation, should be exempt from equal taxation."

The joint committee, made up of charities, taxation, legislative powers, and education, numbers sixty-six delegates, or nearly half of the entire convention. There are thirty-eight Republicans and twenty-eight Democrats on this great joint committee—Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Hebrews.

THE AGE LIMIT OF JUDGES.—In the same convention an amendment was proposed relative to the age limit of judges of the New York Supreme Court, spoken of by the *Sun* as meeting with general approval. It changed the terms of the judges of this court from fourteen years to ten years, and the limit of the age to which a justice can serve from seven

seventy-five years, and also abolishes the pension act which continues the compensation of a judge after the time limit has expired. Mr. Moore, the proposer, says that most of the very best judges in this state have been at their best, as such, when they reached the age of seventy years. Their knowledge of law, their experience, ripened by many years of practice and upon the bench, make them the most valuable of officers for the interest of suitors, and it is not only depriving the people of this experience and legal knowledge, but also cruel to the judge thus shelved, both as to usefulness to himself and to the people at a time when he could give them his best services.

MAKING UNITED STATES SENATORS ELECTIVE.—The dilatory and wavering policy manifested in our "American House of Lords," and its "ultraconservatism" in matters concerning which the people demand a forward movement, is calling forth numerous criticisms, of which the following, from *Christian Work*, is an example: "The fact is the Senate has become a political club for the mutual protection of individual interests, and that, too, often regardless of political proclivities. This accounts for the good fellowship among senators, and it further explains why in order to oblige a senator the public interests of the country are coolly put aside. The Senate has sadly degenerated from what it once was. The only remedy that seems possible is to make senators elective. Not until this is done will senators become truly representative, and give the interests of the country the first consideration."

A GOOD WORD FOR THE INSTITUTE.—In a recent issue, the *New York Mail and Express*, referring to untoward tendencies in our politics, says: "It is well to be reminded that, although somewhat tardy in its inspiration and development, there exists an organization, incorporated under the laws of Congress, whose object is the promotion of good government through good citizenship.

"Universal suffrage is looked upon in some quarters as experimental as yet, and there is ample work, in the illumination of the pervading darkness enshrouding the majority of our national legislators just now, for many more expounders of the safeguards of our free institutions and the exaltation of the standard of citizenship than the limited band of workers combined in the several branches of the Institute of Civics. Still, if this organization has lagged necessarily in its preliminary achievement, it has unquestionably taken root in no uncertain way, and in hundreds of educational institutions throughout the land the impetus its publications and methods have given to the systematic study of good government and the ethics of suffrage has been marked and widely felt. The claim of its projectors that the Institute is in the forefront in a great patriotic movement that nothing can prevent from going forward, is indisputable."

PROMOTION OF CIVIC VIRTUE.—Dr. T. W. Braidwood, a councilor of the Institute, frequently contributes to the Vineland, N. J., *Evening*

Journal articles in furtherance of its aims. Under date of June 5 he says: "No sacred constitution can safeguard the freedom and welfare of a people who allow every center of population to be degraded by the will and say-so of irresponsible politicians. There may be Congress and state legislatures objectional proceedings, but are not towns and cities under the dictation of party rings, the very center of civic and political corruption? It is in the reform of our municipalities that the reform in our national parties can only begin, not by sporadic effort at election times, but by the organization of permanent institutions for the promotion of civic virtue. Others in Vineland are needed for such vital duties and ought to engage in them; still, I do the best I can to arouse the educated classes of the place from slumber of civic indifference, in the hope that the awakening time will soon come."

THE JEWISH LABOR BUREAU.—*The Altruist* is the title of a quarterly publication conducted by women, and devoted to the promotion of philanthropy. It begins a late number with the pertinent remark that "there can be no more appropriate time than the present for emphasizing the motto of *The Altruist*: 'Every man is called to the service of others.'" In an article referring to the Jewish Labor Bureau of New York, it says: "The Hebrews are the only people who systematically care for their own poor, and, while representatives of every other race are begging in the streets, the Jew is never a public burden. When he arrives at Castle Garden he is taken in charge by an agent of the United Hebrew Charities, he is provided with work or set to work in a trade, and his family is cared for until he becomes self-supporting. Supervision does not cease when the Jew leaves New York, but extends to other cities. A Jew is not given a loaf of bread or a sum of money, but he is given instead, the opportunity of caring for himself and his family. Surely there is here much for us to imitate."

LICENSING HOUSES OF PROSTITUTION.—The citizens of Louisville, Ky., are agitated by a proposal now under consideration to license houses of prostitution. *The Courier Journal*, as might be expected, voices the opposing public sentiment. A condensed statement of the controversy is given in the issue of *Public Opinion* of May 31, as follows: "It is not likely that the Board of Public Safety will find the people of Louisville prepared for adopting its views. The plan proposed is not a new one. In most of its details it has been tried before. It is some improvement on previous experiments in so far as it proposes to devote all sums collected for the licensing of disorderly houses to the maintenance of a house for fallen women. The board seeks to realize the strength of the objection on moral grounds to giving a status, by license or registry, to prostitution, but defends its plan on the ground that the license it proposes is not for revenue, but for regulation; that it is a practical means of raising, without cost to the city, a fund for the purpose of affording to abandoned women opportu-

for leading better lives. It is not likely, however, that this will reconcile the public to the appearance of giving legal sanction to immorality. There has been in the United States but one conspicuous experiment with licensed prostitution. That was at St. Louis, under a law passed by the Missouri legislature in 1870. The experiment was abandoned after four years' trial, having disappointed the expectations of its advocates. It had resulted in an increase in the number of professed prostitutes and a greater increase still in clandestine prostitution. The St. Louis experiment has been frequently but erroneously pointed out as proof of the efficiency of the license system. Something similar seems to have been tried at Cleveland, where the chief of police is said to have assumed authority to set up a system of registration, combined with medical examinations. Mr. Aaron W. Powell, in a paper read before the New York Academy of Medicine not long ago, said he had been informed that the result of the experiment at Cleveland had been wholly demoralizing, the women becoming bolder in the feeling of immunity from police interference. In Europe there has been a more thorough test of the license system. It was tried in England, and was abandoned in 1886 as a failure, upon unquestionable proof that the number of fallen women had increased under the operation of the system. Other European countries have persisted longer in the license plan, but it was stated by Mr. Powell, in the paper referred to above, and after the gathering of information on the subject, that Europe is on the point of abandoning the system as a failure."

CORRUPT POLICEMEN.—Apropos of this discussion is the shameful disclosures now being made under legislative investigation in New York City, which clearly establish the fact that policemen, including sergeants and captains, have for a long time "protected" houses of prostitution, and as the price of their infamy, extorted "fees" as high as \$500, in addition to monthly payments of sums of \$50. Disclosures in Boston and other cities point to similar conditions. The horrible rottenness in municipal administration thus uncovered, is in itself sufficient to warrant the utmost efforts for a revival of civic virtue, through a permanent institution like the American Institute of Civics, and for a revolution in politics through Municipal Leagues, Good Government Clubs, and similar organizations. The citizen who does not rise in his manhood, regardless of party lines or any selfish consideration, and aid in stamping out infamies such as these, makes himself a sharer in them.

CONGRESS AND CIVIL SERVICE.—Referring to the recent action of the House of Representatives, in which a large number of members manifested a disposition to refuse an appropriation for the maintenance of the Civil Service Commission, the *Congregationalist*, Boston, says: "The action can scarcely have strengthened the dominant party in the affections of those who are genuine civil service reformers, for while the commissioners' salaries and expenses are provided for, and while

the incident has given Commissioner Roosevelt an opportunity to challenge the most searching investigation, nevertheless it has been proved that nothing but fear of the public and not devotion to principle keep the present law on the books. It is true that President Cleveland has recently extended the classified service and that Postmaster-General Bissell has conformed to the law fairly well, but Mr. Quincy's raid on the consuls, Secretary Carlisle's spoils crusade in the treasury department, and Attorney-General Olney's recent opinion, making assessments of office-holders possible and legal, through a technical interpretation of the law," are cited as discouraging signs. "For an unanswerable array of testimony respecting the indescribable fatuity of our present method of selecting and rewarding our servants in the diplomatic service, the June *Century* must be consulted. Ex-ministers to England, France, Turkey, China, men like Angell, Lincoln, and Strauss, tell that which they have seen and concerning which they do know."

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION.—In a large way, and in the broad field of general culture, "university extension" has come to be recognized as the most useful and efficient means of popular education. Three of the most active centers of this work are Philadelphia, Chicago, and Providence. In Philadelphia is the Society for the Extension of University Teaching, of which Prof. E. J. James, of the University of Pennsylvania, is president. In Chicago the work is directed in connection with Chicago University, largely under the efficient direction of Prof. E. W. Bemis, Ph.D., and the master spirit of the work in Providence is President E. B. Andrews, D.D., of Brown University. All of these gentlemen are councilors of the Institute of Civics, and it is needless to say that in the work whose direction is so largely in their hands they do not neglect to provide for the promotion of good citizenship. The society presided over by Dr. James announces a "summer meeting" in Philadelphia, July 2 to 28, with an attractive program. The lecture on "Civics" will be Prof. Edward T. Devine, who is also the director of the meeting, and will furnish full information as to program and terms of attendance. Address 111 South Fifteenth Street, Philadelphia.

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.—Walla Walla, Washington, has a large patriotic club which was organized in response to matter furnished the Institute of Civics, and published in the *Union* of that city. The president is H. S. Blandford, Esq., and it holds monthly meetings of a character calculated to elevate the standard of citizenship. A recent number of the *Union* has an extended account of a great gathering of citizens under the auspices of this club, for the observance of the birthday of Washington's first governor, Isaac Ingalls Stevens, and the birthdays of Gen. Phil. Sheridan, James Madison, and Andrew Jackson. Hon. Miles C. Moore, the last governor of the territory, on the orators of the occasion, said: "In the city of Newport, Rhode Island, an imposing monument bears this inscription: 'In memory of Major-General Isaac Ingalls Stevens, born in Andover, Mass., M

28, 1818, who gave to the service of his country a quick and comprehensive mind, a warm and generous heart, a firm will and strong arm, and who fell while rallying his command, with the flag of the republic in his dying grasp, at the battle of Chantilly, Va., September 1, 1862.'” Governor Moore then traced the career of Governor Stevens, dwelling upon his services in connection with the exploration for the Pacific Railroad, his administration as Governor of Washington, his prompt measures for quelling the Indian uprising, his career in Congress, his gallant services for the Union in the War of the Rebellion, and his heroic death at Chantilly.

Hon. Isaac L. Sharpstein said of Andrew Jackson, that “There was no occasion in his whole career in which his personal interest appeared in conflict with that of his country that he did not surrender the former for the latter, and it is to be regretted that we do not find more men in this day who are like him in this respect. There is too much disposition to leave the affairs of government exclusively to office-holders and office-seekers. I apprehend that if some of us had devoted a little more of our time in the past to public affairs there would now be no excuse for the appointment of committees to examine into the affairs of our state or our county. General Jackson believed that all public business was a part of the business of each individual citizen, and he at all times so conducted himself. Should his example be more extensively followed, our people would be better citizens, and our city, county, and state be better governed.”

These utterances, appreciative of the real character and spirit of one of the most positive and original of American political leaders, are timely and just. That is not a fair estimate of the man which considers Jackson only as the supposed originator of the “spoils system,” however much the policy of his administration contributed to the establishment and growth of that system. As justly said, by the late Alexander Johnston, “Rotation in office, the notion that *all* public servants must be elected for short terms and easily removable, was first announced in theory by Jefferson, and first attempted in practice by Jackson.” As Mr. Johnston further says, Jackson, in politics, was “the legitimate successor of Jefferson as the assertor of individual rights against the tendency to class formation, but with this difference, that in Jefferson’s time individualism claimed only recognition, while in Jackson’s it had advanced to more active life.” If the theory of Jefferson practically applied by Jackson, as shown in the light of subsequent events, has proven mischievous, this fact warrants no conclusions which reflect upon either the patriotism or the integrity of these or the other statesmen and party leaders who then gave it their support. They sought to guard against the perils of an office-holding class whose power might become dangerous by reason of the permanency in tenure which would place it beyond the reach of public opinion and the popular will.

In carrying their views to the extreme they invited other evils in place of those which they sought to avert. It is, nevertheless, well to be

reminded of the fact that the danger which they feared was a real one and that if it was escaped only by the substitution of another, it is yet to be proven that the one accepted is worse than the one escaped. It will be a wholesome thing for the present generation to lay aside unwarranted prejudices; clear itself of the bias and bile of unreasoning and unworthy partisanship; emulate the zealous patriotism, while profiting by the honest mistakes of the statesmen of other generations and so prepare itself for the wise doing of that which must now be done in order to the correction of past errors and the avoidance of new ones.

We are well on the way toward the correction of the mistaken policy as to the civil service honestly advocated by Jefferson and augured with the best of intentions by Jackson. Public sentiment is increasingly favorable to measures intended to make fitness a prime qualification for office-holding; but it is not to be denied that there is room for honest differences, even between the advocates of reform, as to how far it is wise or safe to proceed in the matter of permanent tenure in office. When men sincerely seeking to promote the highest interests of the civil service find room for honest differences of opinion, these differences should be harmonized by courteous and conciliatory methods. It may be well to act upon the supposition that those who are in doubt as to how far it is safe to go in the direction of establishing a permanent office-holding class, are thoroughly sincere and patriotic. Civil service reform will find no more earnest or honest advocacy than in the pages. But they will not, therefore, refuse recognition of the fact that in passing from theory to practice much is to be learned.

If there is any lesson which may be derived from the policy as to the civil service favored by Jefferson and Jackson, it is that danger lies in extremes. Methods are important, but results are more so. The result desired is not only the purification, the elevation, and the efficiency of the civil service, but the abolition of conditions demoralizing good citizenship and good government alike, under which official positions are brought within the control of victorious politicians, and distribute them as prizes among their retainers. If these conditions can be changed only by tenure of office during good behavior (or tenure for life), let all doubtful good citizens lend their ears with candor and patience to the facts which shall convince them. If the result can be secured by regulations as to tenure more flexible, let other good citizens make use of their ears in like manner. It is by such treatment of the matter that the genuine seekers after that which is for the best interest of government and people will find their way to what they seek.

A NEEDED REFORM.—A Wisconsin paper comments as follows on the plan of holding annual sessions of the legislature:

"The *Albany Argus*, a paper often correct in its diagnosis of democratic principles, makes a great mistake when it antagonizes the proposition before the state constitutional convention for biennial elec-

It affects to see in it a distrust of the people, but the experience of every other state, where the theory has been adopted, shows that the people themselves are greatly in favor of the biennial system. The politicians have opposed the biennial plan everywhere, while the people have favored it and compelled its adoption in most of the states.

"Any plan which will make longer intervals between elections and also between legislative sessions, should receive careful consideration. The people do not like to be harried every year with a political campaign, though it is the life of politicians. Once in two years is often enough for general elections, and also for legislative sessions. The officials are not appreciably farther from the people under such a system, and the reduction in public expenses is considerable.

"There is a general demand for less tinkering with the statutes, and biennial sessions meets it. The main idea, however, in the New York proposition is that local and general elections shall be separated from each other, and it is so good that it is a wonder that anybody can criticize it. The separation is accomplished in Wisconsin by having municipal elections come in the spring and general elections in the fall, and those, too, on the biennial year only, thus giving a longer rest between political campaigns.

"Under a system where all elections are held in the fall, as in New York, the municipal elections could be held in the odd-numbered years and the state elections at the same time as the congressional elections must come, in the even-numbered years, and that is practically the proposition before the convention. The Democrats in the body will make a great mistake if they antagonize it."

THE WORKING GIRL.—Apropos of the discussion now going on in New York on the woman question, a well-informed writer says: "An impression entirely wrong is the one that is made by women speakers. They say working women are crushed down by man; that man is the enemy that must be contended with; that man has taken up arms against the poor working girl. Now every self-supporting woman knows that man is her best friend. He is, as a rule, willing to encourage and promote any woman who is brave enough to enter the field. I have never yet heard a man speak of his women employees in any way but in terms of his highest esteem. Man stands always ready to receive working women on the same social platform as himself, but woman stands aloof, ready to put the working woman under her heel and crush her. Some time ago, because a widower married his bright typewriter he was disowned by his family as though he had done something dishonorable. I am tired of women talkers misrepresenting the true condition of affairs. If they want to improve the poor working girl's lot let them commence by converting themselves to thinking more highly of her."

PROF. ELY'S SOCIALISM.—A reviewer of Mr. Ely's new work on socialism in the *Pittsburg Commercial Gazette* has the following among

other good things to say of it: "Here are the limits in which socialism is to act—that is, broadly speaking. Mr. Ely suggests the socialization of inventions and improvements, and of undeveloped mineral wealth. He will not admit that when a man buys a piece of land he rightfully buys everything under it to the center of the earth, and above to the boundary of nowhere; that wealth does not represent labor; it is the gift of nature to all men. This implies the socialization of the coal industry, and especially because that industry is one of the inseparable incidents of the railway industry. If Mr. Ely were writing his book now he would doubtless dwell on this, for never has there been in any industry such a disastrous breakdown of the principle of private management as in this. What kind of management that under which men have to telegraph to labor leaders to know they may be allowed to open their mines, to work their own property? What kind of management is that by which business is conducted with aid of officers armed with Winchester rifles and Gatling guns? This is not blaming those men. They are victims to circumstances much as the poorest of their employees. They broke down in the management because, little by little, in the development of the forces Mr. Ely tells of, a burden was put on them under which no man could bear up. Railway men have broken down in the same way, and the loudest calls for federal protection against the ruinous duplication of lines have been from the most experienced of those men."

GOOD GOVERNMENT CLUBS.—In many towns throughout our land there have been established clubs whose aim is to see that the best interests of their respective communities shall not be sacrificed to individual or party ends. They are always composed of the best and most progressive men and usually are entirely non-political. From various causes it sometimes happens that unworthy men are elected to positions of honor and trust, and, neglectful of the confidence reposed in them, seek to profit themselves or the clique they represent regardless of the duty they owe to their fellow-citizens. In so deplorable a state of affairs a good government club can be of the greatest value to the community. Its mere existence has the effect of putting a damper on dishonest practices and of keeping the management of town matters strictly on a business basis.

In the expenditure of public money there are various ways in which it may be in part diverted from the purposes intended. Laying out parks, building and repairing streets and sidewalks, sewers, public buildings, and all public improvements afford opportunities for those who are not averse to making an "honest" dollar out of the public treasury. But with a well-organized good government club always on the alert to see that every cent expended brings a return in results obtained, there is small opportunity for defrauding the people.

A good government club is desirable also because it acts as a brake on extravagance and the unwise use of public funds. A town is often burdened with debt through the injudicious policy of honest but shrewd

sighted officials, whose enthusiasm is greater than their judgment. The knowledge that an intelligent body of men will weigh with calm and clear decision every act, is certain to have a most salutary effect. It is not only the privilege but the duty of taxpayers and those who hope to become taxpayers to thoroughly acquaint themselves with public affairs, to the end that unwise or dishonest men may not bring discredit on the community, and to insure that the people's money shall be so spent as to benefit the people and the town and confer the greatest good on the greatest number.

PITTSBURG TO ABOLISH THE ROD.—The *Pittsburg Post*, in commenting on the recent action of the school principals on the question of abolishing corporal punishment, says :

"The action of the public school principals of this city in recommending the abolition of the rod as a medium of punishment in the schools is a demarcation which aptly illustrates the trend of the times in educational matters. For years past the tendency has been to substitute moral suasion for the birch whenever practicable, and it cannot be said that the results have not been beneficial. The day of the old-time typical pedagogue who, with a rod that closely resembled a club, urged his pupils along the flowery path of knowledge, as Ichabod Crane was wont to do, is, happily, passed away, and in his stead has risen a preceptor in every way his superior, and with conditions so greatly improved that the acquirement of knowledge has become a pleasure instead of a task. Moral suasion, and not brute force, is the argument generally used nowadays.

"It is proposed to expel the pupils who will not behave themselves and obey the rules of the school, and thus do away with the rod. This seems to be a sensible, enlightened, and advanced stand. If a pupil is so incorrigible as to require a beating from time to time to keep him in harmony with the rules and his pleasant surroundings, it is perhaps better for him and the others to weed him out. At any rate it is not likely he will be assisted much by whipping him. He has nowadays every incentive to study and to show a due respect for his teacher and the rules, and if he does not it would perhaps be a wise course to expel him. A few expulsions would work as efficaciously no doubt as a dozen whippings."

AUTOMATIC HANGING.—Connecticut is going to inaugurate a new departure in the execution of criminals. A device has been adopted, and the machine is now being set up in the Hartford state prison, which will virtually compel the criminal to commit suicide. It is an automatic contrivance, run by hydraulic power, and the prisoner springs the trap himself. The machine is designed to be used for the first time in the execution of John Cronin, on August 24.

President Tracy, of the State Board of Charities, strongly opposes the adoption of the new machine. He says in a letter he has just made

public on the subject: "I oppose the proposed machine because, so far as I have been able to learn, the whole reason and only reason for change arises from a desire on the part of those intrusted with the execution of the sentence to escape the responsibility of being in any way directly instrumental in taking the life of the culprit. The court in condemning a prisoner to death, never intends in passing judgment that he shall in any sense become, or even be allowed to become, in the remotest degree an active agent in his own destruction. If such automatic appliances are to become the fashion, why may not the judge take a phonograph to the quiet seclusion of his private office, deliver his sentence into it, have it placed on his desk in the court room, connected by a wire running under the floor to within a few feet of the prisoner's chair and so arranged that when the latter arises and steps forward his weight may complete the circuit, and the phonograph would do the rest? Then the poor wretch, after having passed the sentence of death upon himself, would be all ready to go to Wethersfield and there hang himself, thereby avoiding the necessity of wounding the sensibilities of either the judge or the hangman."

TRAINED NURSES IN THE STATE HOSPITALS.—Governor Pattison hit the center of the mark in his speech before the Medico-Psychological Association, when he insisted that the employment of trained nurses at the hospitals for the insane as the first step forward in the work of restoration for which the hospitals were primarily intended. It is necessary to get as far away as possible from the erroneous and vulgar idea that hospitals are places of detention, in which the insane are lodged as a matter of provision and safety, as criminals are kept in jail. Hospitals have heretofore been built, as well as managed, with greater regard for the safe-keeping of their inmates than for proper ministrations as should send them forth into the world as a made whole in body and mind. But what can the most accomplished alienist do, when put in charge of a crowded state hospital, with only a proper number of trained assistants? He has a thousand patients to look after with one pair of eyes. Aided by careful, willing, accurate and accomplished helpers, the condition of every patient might be brought within supervisory direction. Without such competent nurses, adequate supervision is impossible, and cure becomes a matter of chance rather than of calculation.

Happily, Governor Pattison's suggestion was followed by the interesting and illuminating address of Dr. S. Wier Mitchell, in which he insisted on hospitals for the insane as they are, and as they might be, were intrusted before the public gaze—like the two pictures which Hawthorne, with eager insistence, thrust before the eyes of his mother and daughter, that even madness would not err in reserving

" . . . some quantity of choice
To serve in such a difference."

Improved hospital service, from which politics shall be eliminated and scientific treatment brought to the front, cannot be objected

cause of the necessity for larger expenditure. Money has been thrown away in the erection of unnecessarily expensive buildings, following what Dr. Mitchell aptly designated as the "quasi-prison idea." Much money might be saved in this direction; but much more money would be saved in employing trained nurses, instead of the haphazard, ignorant, unaccustomed, sometimes brutal attendants who are set to do a work which requires special aptitude without any other qualification than mere physical capability. It would be cheaper for the state to cure lunatics and send them out of the hospitals than to neglect the means of cure and support them. Hundreds of the "chronic" insane are not incurable. They are often persons who have not had the opportunity of cure.

The breezy discussions before the Medico-Psychological Association, although unexpected, will have a most happy effect in bringing before the public the dry-rot conditions in the state hospital service, and may result in the adoption of remedial measures.—*Philadelphia Record*.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CIVICS.

COLLEGE AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL DEPARTMENT.

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS OF THE INSTITUTE'S FACULTY.

In the following colleges and professional schools, one or more members of the board of instruction, as indicated, is an associate member of the Institute's faculty. It is the aim of the Institute to serve as a medium through which these instructors may be brought into cooperation in the important patriotic service of promoting, in all higher institutions of learning, that adequate attention to the essential principles of popular government, practically as well as philosophically considered, which shall make high scholarship an assured qualification for best citizenship and best service in public station.

Students in the institutions thus brought into relations with the Institute, are entitled to compete for the "Hall Prizes" annually awarded (in June) to seniors presenting the best papers relating to civics questions.

The executive headquarters of the Institute, 38 Park Row, New York City, always open to the public, is a depository of current literature (books, catalogues, and other matter) relating to these institutions.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS, as the official organ of the Institute, is a medium for the publication of matter of special interest and value to the instructors and students in these and other American colleges and professional schools. It has the assistance editorially of the president and other councilors, and has the promise of cooperation in the way of contributed matter from many of the distinguished members of the Institute named below:

J. J. Jarvis, pres. Add-Ran Christian Univ., Thorp's Spring, Texas.
J. W. Lowber, Ph.D., LL.D., Add-Ran Christian Univ., Thorp's Spring, Texas.

James K. Powers, Alabama State Normal Col., Florence, Ala.

Lester C. Rogers, A. M., Prof. of Civics, Alfred Univ., Alfred City, New York.

J. F. Spence, LL.D., American Temperance Univ., Harriman, Tenn.

Merrill E. Gates, Ph.D., LL.D., pres. Amherst Col., Amherst, Mass.

John Bates Clark, Ph.D., Amherst Col., Amherst, Mass.

Wm. Lewis Montague, Ph.D., Amherst Col., Amherst, Mass.

Rev. John Franklin Genung, Ph.D., Amherst Col., Amherst, Mass.

Daniel A. Long, D.D., pres. Antioch Col., Yellow Springs, Ohio.

Edward H. Murfee, A.M., LL.D., Arkansas Industrial Univ., Fayetteville, Ark.

Rev. Horace Bumstead, D.D., pres. Atlanta Univ., Atlanta, Ga.

C. W. Foss, A.M., pres. Augustana Col., Rock Island, Ill.

Joseph E. Stubbs, D.D., pres. Baldwin Univ., Berea, Ohio.

William W. Prescott, A.M., pres. Battle Creek Col., Battle Creek, Mich.

Rufus C. Burleson, D.D., pres. Baylor-Waco Univ., Waco, Texas.

E. D. Eaton, D.D., pres. Beloit Col., Beloit, Wis.

L. V. Dodge, A.M., Berea Col., Berea, Ky.

C. F. Peterson, A.M., Bethany Col., Lindsborg, Kan.

J. L. Dickens, D.D., pres. Bethel Col., McKenzie, Tenn.

John Phelps Fruit, Bethel Col., Russellville, Ky.

- Rev. Edward I. Devitt, S.J., Boston Col., Boston, Mass.
 William MacDonald, A.B., Bowdoin Col., Brunswick, Me.
 F. H. M. Henderson, D.D., pres. Bowdon Col., Bowdon, Ga.
 George G. Wilson, Ph.D., Wilfred H. Munroe, Ph.D., E. Benjamin
 Andrews, D.D., LL.D., pres. Brown Univ., Providence, R. I.
 Franklin A. Giddings, Ph.D., Bryn Mawr Col., Bryn Mawr, Pa.
 O. Cone, D.D., pres. Buchtel Col., Akron, Ohio.
 Calvin Easterley, pres. California Col., Los Angeles, Cal.
 Charles H. Cooper, Carleton Col., Northfield, Minn.
 Merwin Marie Snell, Rector Catholic Univ., Washington, D. C.
 Rev. J. Braden, Ph.D., Central Tennessee Col., Nashville, Tenn.
 L. H. Blanton, D.D., chancellor Central Univ. Kentucky, Richmond,
 Ky.
 Herman A. Koch, D.D., Central Wesleyan Col., Warrenton, Mo.
 J. W. Moncrief, D.D., Christian Univ., Canton, Mo.
 Graham Taylor, Chicago Theological Sem., Chicago, Ill.
 Rev. David Clark John, D.D., pres. Clark Univ., S. Atlanta, Ga.
 Rev. J. B. Van Petten, Ph.D., Claverack Col., Claverack, N. Y.
 Shailer Mathews, A.M., Colby Univ., Waterville, Me.
 Henry E. Shepherd, LL.D., pres. College of Charleston, Charleston, S. C.
 Jas. C. Welling, LL.D., Columbian Univ., Washington, D. C.
 Alston Ellis, pres. Colorado Agricultural Col., Ft. Collins, Colo.
 Frank H. Loud, Colorado Col., Colorado Springs, Colo.
 Francis Marion Burdick, LL.D., Columbia Univ. Law School, New
 York, N. Y.
 Franklin A. Giddings, Ph.D., Columbia Univ., New York, N. Y.
 Jeremiah W. Jenks, Ph.D., Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N. Y.
 S. G. Williams, Ph.D., Cornell Univ., Cornell, N. Y.
 Rev. William F. King, D.D., LL.D., pres. Cornell Col., Mt. Vernon, Ia.
 Nathan Green, LL.D., Cumberland Univ., Lebanon, Tenn.
 Rev. Wm. J. Tucker, D.D., LL.D., pres. Dartmouth Col., Hanover,
 N. H.
 Henry L. Smith, Davidson Col., Davidson, N. C.
 Albert N. Raub, A.M., Ph.D., pres. Delaware Col., Newark, Del.
 Jno. B. D. John, D.D., DePauw Univ., Greencastle, Ind.
 Rev. Geo. E. Reed, D.D., LL. D., pres. Dickinson Col., Carlisle, Pa.
 Rev. David B. Perry, A.M., pres. Doane Col., Crete, Neb.
 N. J. Morrison, D.D., pres. Drury Col., Springfield, Mo.
 J. J. Mills, pres. Earlham Col., Richmond, Ind.
 Rev. Rufus S. Green, D.D., pres. Elmira Col., Elmira, N. Y.
 I. S. Hopkins, D.D., LL.D., Emory Col., Oxford, Ga.
 W. M. Grier, D.D., pres. Erskine Col., Due West, S. C.
 Rev. R. A. Beard, D.D., Fargo Col., Fargo, N. D.
 Rev. J. R. H. Latchaw, A.M., pres. Findlay Col., Findlay, O.
 W. T. Stott, pres. Franklin Col., Franklin, Ind.
 O. Clute, M.S., LL.D., pres. Fla. Agri. Col., Lake City, Fla.
 Rev. Jno. S. Stahr, Ph.D., D.D., pres. Franklin and Marshall Col.,
 Lancaster, Pa.
 Charles Manly, D.D., pres. Furman Univ., Greenville, S. C.
 J. Irvin Smith, pres. Galesville Univ., Galesville, Wis.
 J. M. Wagstaff, pres. Gap Col., Buffalo Gap, Tex.
 H. W. Everett, Ph.D., Garfield Univ., Wichita, Kan.
 Rev. H. K. Warren, A.M., pres. Gates Col., Neligh, Neb.
 James M. Coleman, A.M., Geneva Col., Beaver Falls, Pa.
 Arthur Yager, Ph.D., Georgetown Col., Georgetown, Ky.
 Carl J. Petri, Gustav Adolfs Col., St. Peter, Minn.
 Melancthon Woolsey Stryker, D.D., LL.D., pres. Hamilton Col., Clin-
 ton, N. Y.
 Rev. Richard McIlwaine, D.D., pres. Hampden-Sidney Col., Hamp-
 den-Sidney, Va.

- Rev. H. B. Frissel, prin. Hampton Normal and Ag. Inst., Hampton
 Edward Channing, Ph. D., Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.
 Isaac Sharpless, Sc.D., LL.D., pres. Haverford Col., Haverford, Pa.
 J. H. Brunner, D.D., pres. Hiawassee Col., Hiawassee P. O., Tenn.
 Edwin Lester Hall, Hiram Col., Hiram, O.
 Hon. Geo. Frank Mosher, LL.D., pres. Hillsdale Col., Hillsdale, N. Y.
 Rev. E. N. Potter, D.D., LL.D., pres. Hobart Col., Geneva, N. Y.
 Charles Scott, pres. Hope Col., Holland, Mich.
 Rev. R. M. Coulter, pres. Hopedale Normal Col., Cadiz, O.
 Rev. Jeremiah E. Rankin, D.D., LL.D., pres. Howard Univ.,
 Washington, D. C.
 Prof. Harvey W. Milligan, Illinois Col., Jacksonville, Ill.
 W. H. Wilder, D.D., pres. Illinois Wesleyan Univ., Bloomington
 E. W. Stanton, M.Sc., Iowa Agricultural Col., Ames, Ia.
 Jesse Macy, A.M., Iowa Col., Grinnell, Ia.
 Rev. W. R. Rothwell, D.D., pres. Jewell Col., Liberty, Mo.
 H. C. Adams, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md.
 W. H. Sweet, D.D., pres. Kansas Wesleyan Univ., Salina, Kan.
 Jas. K. Patterson, LL.D., pres. Kentucky State Col., Lexington
 Prof. O. G. Klinger, Kee Mar Col., Hagerstown, Md.
 William Foster Peirce, Kenyon Col., Gambier, O.
 Hon. Newton Bateman, LL.D., pres. Knox Col., Galesburg, Ill.
 Rev. J. S. McCulloch, D.D., Knoxville Col., Knoxville, Tenn.
 Ethelbert D. Warfield, D.D., LL.D., pres. Lafayette Col., Easton
 George R. McNeill, A.M., Ph.D., pres. Lafayette Col., Lafayette
 J. J. Halsey, Ph.D., Lake Forest Univ., Lake Forest, Ill.
 Brother Fabrician, LaSalle Col., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Edward C. Mitchell, D.D., Leland Univ., New Orleans, La.
 A. E. Turner, A.M., pres. Lincoln Univ., Lincoln, Ill.
 Fernando Sanford, Ph.D., Leland Stanford Univ., Palo Alto, Cal.
 E. Harlow Russell, prin. Massachusetts State Normal School,
 South Hadfield, Mass.
 Davis R. Dewey, Ph.D., Mass. Inst. Technology, Boston, Mass.
 Rev. Edward Duffield Neill, D.D., Macalester Col., Minnesota
 Rev. Casper J. Leib, S.J., Marquette Col., Milwaukee, Wis.
 Rev. W. O. Thompson, D.D., pres., Rev. Andrew D. Hepburn
 Miami Univ., Oxford, O.
 Lewis G. Gorton, pres. Michigan Agricultural Col., Ag. Col.
 Mich.
 Rev. Herrick Johnson, D.D., LL.D., McCormick Theo. Sem.,
 Wash. D. C.
 Ezra Brainerd, LL.D., pres., Walter E. Howard, Ph.D., Mich.
 Col., Middlebury, Vt.
 J. Hopwood, A.M., pres. Milligan Col., Milligan, Tenn.
 Miss Mary Ellis, A.M., Mills Col., San Francisco, Cal.
 Prof. Monroe Vayhinger, Moore's Hill Col., Moore's Hill, Ind.
 Tamerlane Pliny Marsh, D.D., LL.D., Mt. Union Col., Alliance
 J. N. Beard, pres. Napa Col., Napa City, Cal.
 Rev. G. W. Holland, Ph.D., pres. Newbury Col., Newbury, S.
 Charles C. Rounds, prin. New Hampshire State Normal Sch.
 Portsmouth, N. H.
 Henry Wade Rogers, LL.D., pres. Northwestern Univ., Evanston
 James Monroe, Ph.D., Oberlin Col., Oberlin, O.
 Wm. A. Obenchain, pres. Ogden Col., Bowling Green, Ky.
 H. S. Lehr, pres. Ohio Normal Univ., Ada, O.
 Geo. Wells Knight, Ph.D., Ohio State Univ., Columbus, O.
 Rev. Jas. W. Bashford, Ph.D., Ohio Wesleyan Univ., Delaware
 Willard G. Sperry, Olivet Col., Olivet, Mich.
 H. C. Merrill, Ottawa Univ., Ottawa, Kan.
 Rev. H. A. Thompson, D.D., pres. Otterbein Univ., Westerville, Ohio.

- J. W. Conger, pres. Ouachita Baptist Col., Arkadelphia, Ark.
 Rev. Ambrose C. Smith, D.D., pres. Parsons Col., Fairfield, Ia.
 Geo. W. Atherton, LL.D., pres. Pennsylvania State Col., State College, Pa.
 Prof. Edward Earl Sparks, A.M., Pennsylvania State Col., State College, Pa.
 J. F. Ellis, D.D., pres. Pacific Univ., Forest Grove, Ore.
 Miss Helen E. Pelletreau, Pennsylvania Col. for Women, Pittsburg, Pa.
 Miss Janet L. Brownlee, Pennsylvania Col. for Women, Pittsburg, Pa.
 John A. Hines, Pennsylvania Col., Gettysburg, Pa.
 Wm. Henslee, pres. Pierce Christian Col., College City, Cal.
 Wm. M. Blackburn, D.D., pres. Pierre Univ., E. Pierre, S. D.
 J. Gordon Ogden, Ph.D., Pittsburg Female Col., Pittsburg, Pa.
 Woodrow Wilson, Ph.D., Princeton Univ., Princeton, N. J.
 E. A. Huston, Purdue Univ., Lafayette, Ind.
 J. A. Kern, Randolph-Macon Univ., Ashland, Va.
 Rev. Rufus C. Flagg, D.D., Ripon Col., Ripon, Wis.
 Julius D. Dreher, Ph.D., Roanoke Col., Salem, Va.
 A. Owen, D.D., pres. Roger Williams Univ., Nashville, Tenn.
 C. E. Libby, S.T.D., pres. Rust Univ., Holly Springs, Miss.
 Prof. D. S. Martin, Rutgers Female Col., New York, N. Y.
 S. J. Jones, A.M., Ph.D., Salado Col., Salado, Tex.
 W. E. Hamilton, Simpson Col., Indianola, Ia.
 E. B. Meredith, B.D., Sioux Falls Univ., Sioux Falls, Dak.
 Prof. R. Means Davis, S. Carolina Col., Columbia, S. C.
 Prof. Jno. Hull, Ph.D., S. Illinois State Normal Univ., Carbondale, Ill.
 B. L. Arnold, State Col., Cornwallis, Ore.
 Ira More, prin. State Normal School, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Charles C. Rounds, prin. State Normal School, Plymouth, N. H.
 A. H. Campbell, Ph.D., prin. State Normal School, Johnson, Vt.
 Rev. J. Sasia, S.J., St. Ignatius Col., San Francisco, Cal.
 Rev. Thos. Fell, D.D., St. John's Col., Annapolis, Md.
 A. G. Gains, D.D., St. Lawrence Univ., Canton, N. Y.
 John P. Brophy, St. Louis Col., New York, N. Y.
 R. B. Fairbairn, D.D., LL.D., St. Stephen's Col., Annandale, N. Y.
 Rt. Rev. L. Schnerr, O.S.B., St. Vincent's Col., West Moreland Co., Pa.
 Dr. R. C. Hitchcock, pres. Straight Univ., New Orleans, La.
 William Penn Holcomb, Ph.D., Swarthmore Col., Swarthmore, Pa.
 W. P. Coddington, D.D., Syracuse Univ., Syracuse, N. Y.
 J. H. McLean, A.M., D.D., Southwestern Univ., Georgetown, Texas.
 Robert Price, D.D., Southwestern Presbyterian Univ., Clarksville, Tenn.
 W. M. Brooks, D.D., pres. Tabor Col., Tabor, Ia.
 Rev. J. A. Thompson, A.M., Tarkio Col., Tarkio, Mo.
 Rev. George W. Smith, D.D., LL.D., Trinity Col., Hartford, Conn.
 John Franklin Crowell, Ph.D., Trinity Col., Durham, N. C.
 B. D. Cockrill, pres. Trinity Univ., Tehuacana, Texas.
 Elmer H. Capen, D.D., Tufts Col., College Hill, Mass.
 Wm. Preston Johnson, LL.D., pres. Tulane Univ. Louisiana, New Orleans, La.
 H. D. Clayton, pres. of Univ. of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Ala.
 Col. R. A. Hardaway, Univ. of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Ala.
 Theodore B. Comstock, D.S., pres., Edward M. Boggs, Ph.D., Univ. of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.
 John LeConte, LL.D.; Bernard Moses, LL.D.; Eugene W. Hilgard, Ph.D.; Irving Stringham, Ph.D.; Prof. S. W. Dennis, M.D.; Univ. of California, Berkeley, Cal.
 Hon. Jacob D. Cox, LL.D., pres., Univ. of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
 Rev. H. M. MacCracken, D.D., LL.D., Chancellor, Jerome Allen, Ph.D., Univ. City of New York, New York, N. Y.

- Edward W. Bemis, Ph.D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 James H. Baker, pres. Univ. of Colorado, Denver, Colo.
 F. B. Gault, pres. Univ. of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.
 David Kinley, Univ. of Illinois, Champaign, Ill.
 John K. Commons, Ph.D., Univ. of Indiana, Bloomington, Ind.
 F. W. Blackmar, Univ. of Kansas, Topeka, Kansas.
 Col. Robert Graham, Univ. of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
 Wilmont H. Goodale, Univ. of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.
 Prof. Henry C. Adams, Ph.D., W. H. Payne, Ph.D., Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Wm. W. Folwell, LL.D., Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Hon. James S. Robbins, Univ. of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Hon. Kemp P. Battle, LL.D., pres. Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
 Webster Merrifield, pres. Univ. of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. D.
 William C. Main, Univ. of Denver, Union Park, Colo.
 J. H. Canfield, chancellor Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
 Leroy D. Brown, Ph.D., Univ. of Nevada, Reno, Nev.
 Rev. David R. Kerr, Ph.D., D.D., Univ. of Omaha, Omaha, Neb.
 Edmund J. James, Ph.D., Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Prof. P. H. Eagan, Wm. Rice Simms, LL.D., Univ. of Mississippi, University, Miss.
 William C. Morey, Ph.D., Univ. of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
 Wm. Henry Graham, Univ. of the South, Sewanee, Miss.
 Hon. Henry H. Ingersoll, LL.D., Univ. of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
 Prof. Leslie Waggoner, LL.D., Univ. of Texas, Austin, Tex.
 Matthew H. Buckham, D.D., Univ. of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
 E. M. Turner, pres. Univ. of W. Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.
 Richard T. Ely, Ph.D., Prof. Frederick J. Turner, Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
 S. F. Scovel, D.D., pres. Univ. of Wooster, Wooster, O.
 Albinus A. Johnson, A.M., D.D., Univ. of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.
 Thos. Freeman Moses, A.M., M.D., Urbana Univ., Urbana, O.
 Rev. Elcharles A. Devore, Union Christian Col., Merom, Ind.
 J. W. Bissell, Upper Iowa Univ., Fayette, Ia.
 Chas. A. Tuttle, Ph.D., Wabash Col., Crawfordville, Ind.
 Chas. E. Taylor, D.D., Wake Forest Col., Wake Forest, N. C.
 J. E. Stubbs, D.D., LL.D., pres. Wallace Col., Berea, O.
 E. M. Wright, Warren Col., Fullers, Tenn.
 Peter McVicar, D.D., pres. Washburn Col., Topeka, Kan.
 Marshall S. Snow, LL.D., Washington Univ., St. Louis, Mo.
 Rev. Jas. D. Moffat, D.D., pres. Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa.
 G. W. Curtis Lee, LL.D., Jas. Addison Quarles, D.D., LL.D., Washington and Lee Univ., Lexington, Va.
 Willard Clark Fisher, B.A., Wesleyan Univ., Middletown, Conn.
 J. L. Kephart, D.D., Westfield Col., Westfield, Ill.
 Rev. C. F. Thwing, D.D., pres. Western Reserve Univ., Cleveland, Ohio.
 I. A. Loos, B.D., Western Col., Toledo, Ia.
 W. J. Holland, Ph.D., D.D., Western Univ. of Pa., Pittsburg, Pa.
 John W. Heston, Washington Ag. Col., Pullman, Wash.
 Chas. A. Blanchard, pres. Wheaton Col., Wheaton, Ill.
 Wm. D. Lyman, A.M., Whitman Col., Walla Walla, Wash.
 Rev. I. B. Scott, A.M., D.D., pres. Wiley Univ., Marshall, Tex.
 Dr. John Hull, pres. Wisconsin State Normal School, River Falls, Wis.
 W. R. Rothwell, William Jewell Col., Liberty, Mo.
 S. W. Percy, pres. Winchester Col., Winchester, Ky.
 James H. Carlisle, Wofford Col., Spartansburg, S. C.
 T. E. Pedan, pres. West Virginia Col., Flemington, W. Va.
 Prof. H. H. Swain, Yankton Col., Yankton, S. D.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS.

AUGUST, 1894.

THE ABOLITION OF PAUPERISM.

BY E. E. HALE, D.D

I SHALL confine myself wholly to showing the radical and absolute distinction between the work we do for "the abolition of pauperism" and that which we do for "the relief of poverty."

I wish, indeed, that I could fix in the memory of my readers the distinction I have to explain, by appearing in two characters, almost, indeed, as if I were two men. As explaining the critical necessity for the abolition of pauperism, they ought to think of me as a stern reformer, as a man careful for the race, but apparently careless of the individual. I should speak to them in the words of warning and, indeed, terror, as John Knox frightened poor frivolous Mary from her iniquities, or tried to do so. On the other hand, the lecturer on the relief of poverty should, in affectionate language, command all sympathies for separate persons, now in suffering. We should be reminded at every word that "the man is greater than humanity," and taught that where life is in the scale, no theory of ours must be permitted to stand in the way of the service which brother can and must render to brother. And in what we teach each other of the great hospitalities in the relief of poverty, there shall be no end of discouragement or doubt. We shall not bate a jot of the privilege of working the infinite miracles which God is willing to promise to all his sons and daughters.

But we will and must keep steadily in mind the distinction between "pauperism" and "poverty." It is pity of pities that the two words begin with the same letter, and are derived from

the same root. For the ordinary confusion of the two, a fusion which runs into all familiar conversation and des three out of four of the printed discussions on subjects nected with either, is a very great misfortune. And until unless we clear ourselves wholly from this confusion we m well abandon all hope, either of relieving poverty to purpose, or, on the other hand, of abolishing pauperism.

In a sense perfectly intelligible, we are all poor. We need the help which others give us. It is a good study i subject of poverty when any man specially attempts t where he would be after twenty-four hours if he were alon he were Robinson Crusoe in his island, or Silvio Pellic attended in his cell. How would we spend this afternoo to-morrow morning if there were not, or had not hundreds, thousands of people around us preparing th might eat and drink, that we might be clothed and housed we might have the books we read, the paper we write upo ink we write with? We are all poor. That is, we are a condition of mutual dependence.

The Savior of men, quoting the same expression fro greatest of lawgivers, recognized this mutual dependence, words so often flung in our faces by fools, "The poor y always with you." It is fortunately most true. It ex the dependence which makes the czar of Russia need t of the peasant who ploughs the land. Without this mut pendence there is no social order.

But, alas!—one chafes as he remembers this and says cause the Savior of men thus spoke of mutual dependen spoke, by the way, to Iscariot, as one likes to remember. ing sentimentalists on the one hand, and miserly Isca the other, throw in our teeth the phrase, when we are t remove the causes of wretchedness, much as they might Mrs. Partington when she swept back the tides of Can her broom. "O, but you know the poor will neve from the land. O, but you know 'the poor we have with us.'" As if, because Jesus Christ rebuked Judas there must be typhoid fever in the slums of a city! A

must starve, when the harvests of the world are bursting its granaries! Such a statement, in any particular detail, shows its own folly. But all the same, in public discussion, you will hear men speak as if chronic and intentional beggary were to be encouraged. The "mendicant orders" are spoken of with a certain approbation. There must be poverty, as there must be tempest. "Therefore"—this is almost the argument—"we ought to encourage pauperism." As a man might say, we ought to nurse an infant cyclone.

The most important work of Joseph Tuckerman, one of the saints of the Unitarian Church, was his work in separating the boards and offices which, in his own city of Boston, had to do on the one hand with the abolition of pauperism, and on the other hand with the relief of poverty.

So well did he do this work that, in admiration and surprise, De Gerando, the most important European writer of that time on these subjects, said with delight, when he read Tuckerman's works: "This man understands the difference between pauperism and poverty." The words would be a good epitaph over his grave.

As we are considering, very briefly, the foundation principles of studies to which a man may well devote his life, I must be permitted to state, without argument, many of these principles.

I. Take it as fundamental that pauperism may be abolished. Pauperism is the permanent dependence of a hereditary class upon the state. Now, we, among other duties, pledge ourselves to the abolition of pauperism, confident that it is possible.

Torture of witness in court was a custom of European tribunals within 150 years. Torture has been abolished. Slavery was an institution in America till 1865. Slavery has been abolished.

If we are the men and women I believe we are, and address ourselves to this duty, pauperism will be abolished in the United States before we die, just as leprosy and smallpox and scarlet fever can be abolished, whenever the governor of a state chooses to abolish them.

It is to be observed first, as Tuckerman showed, that the

agencies and offices of the people who want to abolish pauperism, are different and separate from those of the people who want to relieve poverty. It is a good thing, indeed, if you do not need the same people, to speak two languages, as it were, when they shift from side to side in these two sets of duties.

The parallel is precise with what we see in the details of public health. Suppose a town smitten with typhoid fever. Naturally the doctors who have to treat and cure the sick people are those who first discover and point out the cause of the disease. They call on the community to avert it. It proves, for instance, as it proved at Lawrence, on the Merrimac river, that drinking water was polluted from sewage above them. It then proved that a system of filtration was necessary to avert the plague. The city carried this work through and the disease was virtually annihilated.

Now, we are a practical people, and we see at a glance that it would be absurd to make these doctors make the surveys for new reservoirs and the channels which lead to them—absurd to make them study the laws of filtration, to cleanse the water, and then to supply it to the town. We see at once that this matter is intrusted to civil engineers and men of their training. When a doctor has given the alarm, the engineer must provide the remedy.

The person who personally relieves poverty is very probably not the best man to carry out the work of abolishing pauperism. The doctor most successful in managing typhoid may be the least most learned in cements, in quarrying, or in the building of culverts. It is even more dangerous in the case of pauperism. For the generous habit of one duty may unfit a man for the wholesome severity of the other. We remember all along that "the man is greater than humanity." We must not let our eagerness for the race, sacrifice the individual. We are at nine at night to a cold tenement house, where is an old beggar just landed, with four or five starving children and a mother, who has just given birth to a baby. It is not ours, then, to explain to those people that we are abolishing pauperism, that it would be bad for them to belong to a

class, and that any present relief to them would be an injury to mankind. Our business is to get a stove into that room, and some kindly word, and to give the oldest of them some matches, and we ought to have matters so in hand that before the hour is over the woman shall be in bed and the children shall be fed. When to-morrow comes we will have other duties, but this is the practice of the hour. Now, it may happen that the man well trained to this service is not the best man to put in charge of our office for the prevention of pauperism. At the least, we can say this, that it is rather hard on him to make him change back and forth many times in a day, from the one class of duties to the other.

The subject is one to which an expert would gladly give twenty or thirty lectures. I shall have attained my chief object if I have shown that we have two absolutely different duties, and that it may well be that these duties shall seem to conflict with each other. In another article I will speak of what we are to do from day to day in the relief of such need as may appeal to us as philanthropic, public spirited citizens. I speak now on the other business, which I have compared to that of the civil engineer, and in the space at my disposal I can only indicate the subdivisions of work in this line.

Speaking, then, practically, I should say that in every American town of a larger population than one hundred thousand persons, there ought to be a separate officer or a separate board whose time should be devoted exclusively to the prevention of pauperism. Officer or board should refer to other authorities the immediate cases of present need requiring present relief; the two duties should not be mixed together, more than we should intrust the duty of filtering the water from the Merri-mac to the physician who is taking charge of a case of typhoid fever. In Boston we have a specially organized society for the prevention of pauperism. Either such a society, or some bureau of the city administration, or some single officer, should have this matter in conscientious charge.

2. The largest duty, perhaps, of such an officer or board will be in putting the round peg into the round hole and the

square peg into the square hole. It seems to be almost a duty of society, in a country like ours, where each large city receives many people from a distance, that there shall be some bureau where a man without employment can find out where he is needed. Be sure he is needed somewhere: there is no sense in nonsense as to talk about an oversupply of labor. The workman is needed somewhere, though it may not be in the locality where he is now. It is the business of him who would prevent pauperism to establish an office, open daily, without charge to the person who needs to be employed, which shall tell where he is needed, and which, if necessary, shall facilitate access to the place of work. For this purpose, this office shall be in active correspondence with the other places in the state and probably with other states, even at a considerable distance. The newer states in our republic, always practical in their arrangements, have already organized such plans, in some of them. The state of Ohio, for instance, maintains, as a part of its police staff, in the principal cities, agents who have offices which are really free intelligence offices, and they are in correspondence with different towns, so that they may be able to send workmen as I have said, where they are needed.

3. In any systematic arrangement, the opening of such an office will very soon connect itself with the opening of industrial schools, where people who are waiting for employment may be almost from the first moment, engaged in improving their ability. Such schools may teach the language of the country to persons who do not know it. They may teach them to read and to write, if they have not such accomplishments. Or they may begin on the training of the hand and the eye. It is no difficult thing to arrange, for instance, for good training in sewing for women who are waiting for employment in such work, and if our staff is large and our resources considerable, we may extend such instruction in various directions.

4. Such an establishment must take oversight of all arrangements for pawnbroking. A good proverb says that "the devil is the devil," and this is quite true. But he is a devil who is not yet exorcised from modern society, and there can be

reason given why, while a rich man, who needs to borrow money to build himself a palace or to equip a railroad, may borrow his money at two per cent a year, the day laborer, who is in immediate need, should pay as much as ninety per cent a year. I have known more than ninety per cent paid when good chattel security was given for the loan; this under an administration about as bad as was possible. On the continent of Europe, as you know, this matter is generally considered a matter for the supervision of the state. Useful lessons may be learned from the administration of the *Mont de Piété*. Your attention has probably been arrested by the efforts now made by persons of intelligence and philanthropy in New York to get the control of the pawnbroking business there. From my own experience and observation, I am quite sure that under proper agencies the price for loans on chattel security might be reduced certainly as low as eight per cent a year, and perhaps lower. At all events, the matter of pawnbroking should not be left in irresponsible hands, as it is left in the arrangements of our cities now.

5. I did not speak first of any effort for the prevention of intemperance, because it goes without saying that pauperism is bred and nursed by intemperance. The subject is one which, of course, is not to be dismissed in a few words; but now I have only to say that, first, second, and last, the bureau which has in charge the prevention of pauperism must engage itself in any effort which seems most promising in that community for the suppression of the saloon, and for other enterprises which look to a complete reform of the habits of tempted men.

6. Without going into detail again, let me say that the sentiment which opposes itself, in necessary cases, to the separation of families, is a sentiment which must not be encouraged. There is no law, human or divine, which gives to an intemperate or profligate father or mother any right to bring up such children as are born to them. The rights, whatever they are, which we have over our children, are conditioned on our using them for the best, and while there is no doubt that maternal or paternal affection is a very valuable element in the oversight of

children, we must not make the mistake of leaving children be ruined, so far as their later prospects in life go, by intruding them to people who have shown themselves unworthy such care.

II. Consider now the immense power which we have in our hands for the abolition of pauperism.

A Christian state reënforces its system of education by the whole drift of its legislation. For it is merely a trick of some penny sophists to speak of education as if it were only an affair of books or of the schools. In a Christian state, all the legislation is guided by the same certainty ; that, if one member suffers, all the members suffer, and by the same determination that no single member shall suffer. The whole theory is that the whole ship may be lost, if there is one rotten treenail. That is the interpretation in politics of the Christian instruction, "Honor all men." So the state provides that industries shall be varied. If Robert Stephenson be born to be a great inventor, he shall not be predestined by any accursed Calvinism to spend his life in fishing for codfish or in harvesting grain. Again, a Christian state provides for the purity of its boys and girls. Even supposing that grown men and women have a right to ruin or throw away their lives, a Christian state screens its boys and girls from the seductions of the liquor shop. Till they are men and women, they shall not be led into temptation. Once more, a Christian state is absolutely just to the weakest classes in its taxation. Of course, states must use money ; but there are thousands of writers—and I think they are right—who say that it is wise for a state so to adjust its taxation that, until a man have somewhat advanced from the nakedness to which he is born, till he has made some accumulation of visible property, he should not be compelled to make a contribution to the state. Of course, if a man wishes to vote, he must pay properly for that privilege. Of course, too, wherever the burden was fixed, he would indirectly bear his share. But the theory supposes that it is well for a state to bend over, beyond the line of strict justice, in its taxation to encourage beginners ; so to speak, to tempt every one to take a share in the commonwealth. We have not wholly failed

this business. Of the population of Massachusetts, men, women, and children, including even newcomers from foreign lands and little babies, who cannot tell their right hands from their left, one half now have deposits in the savings banks. The population of Massachusetts on the first of June, 1892, was computed as being 2,353,000; the number of open accounts in the different savings banks of Massachusetts for the same year was \$1,189,936. The average deposit was \$330.37. All legislation which looks in this direction is genuine. It proceeds on the true hypothesis of a Christian state, that pauperism is only an accident, and never a permanent element in its affairs.

When we apply the immense latent forces of republican government to carry out these principles, we find that comfort is indeed the rule, and pauperism, or what people call poverty, is the exception. This is a great point gained over that sentimental theory of the Kingdom of Heaven, fostered by the Saint Dominics and Saint Francis, and other apostles of beggary, in which poverty is the rule for the great mass of men, and comfort the exception for the rulers, whether in state or church.

I had occasion, some five-and-twenty years ago, to study the social condition of Vineland in New Jersey, when it was seven years old. The population of the town was then ten thousand. Its pauper expenses in 1869 were four dollars, and its police expenses were fifty dollars—the salary of one constable. That is what happens where, by the conditions of the title to real estate, it is impossible for a man permanently to maintain a liquor saloon. If there were any necessity, I could furnish a thousand cases in this country of local administration as satisfactory as this. We are not engaged in an impossible problem, with the gallantry of an officer defending a post where he knows he is eventually to fail. When the Revolutionary War began, Paul Wentworth, a New Hampshire Tory, wrote to Lord North, his employer, that there were many of the thirteen states which did not know what the word "poor-rate" meant, and in which there had never been an almshouse. This shows what is possible in a country whose home administration is in the hands of its own people, if it once determines to abolish pauperism.

EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

THE LIMITS OF PARTY OBLIGATION.

BY HENRY BUDD, ESQ.

IN ALL free nations government by party seems to be indispensable. It is natural that such should be the case, government by party has its root in the very nature of man, and its growth is fostered by his progress in the line of political thought, wherever that thought and its natural result, action, are not suppressed by arbitrary power. Man is gregarious, his ideas can be transformed into action on an extended scale only by union ; coöperation is necessary for achievement.

In an unenlightened state of society, people form themselves into groups, or rather followings, about the strong man, personal leadership divides the community into bodies which uphold the rule of this or that individual ; personal devotion then at its height ; the followers of each leader cling to him with personal fidelity ; he is a hero. Once attracted to him by the force of his personal character, or otherwise, an unreasonable spirit of loyalty takes possession of his adherents ; his enemies their enemy, his friend their friend, his will their will ; all referred to the chief. As man progresses, as his mind becomes more enlightened, when he learns to criticise and to search for the motives, the reasons, of the actions of his chief, he gradually comes to follow him as representing some particular political line of action, some idea, or, perhaps, merely some sentiment. This is the first step away from merely personal fealty ; he follows the chief but as the embodiment of an idea, although yet he does not regard the person of the chief and the idea as bodied as capable of divorce. Later, man recognizes that that not only can there be a separation, in thought, of the leader from the idea, but also that the leader may be a bad exponent of ideas, or an insufficient instrument in the carrying out

policy. This leads him to consider to which his allegiance is, of right, due—to the man who assumes to represent the truth, or to truth itself. As in his thought he distinguishes between the abstract and the concrete, and finds in the one the truth, in the other the mere accidental representative or symbol of it, he rises above the mere devotion to person and fixes his loyalty upon principle, and upon that foundation are, or profess to be, erected modern parties and the system of government by party, which has come to its highest development in the two freest countries in the world, England and the United States of America.

Now, as we review the history and the present condition of those two great countries, we may unhesitatingly say that whatever evils have sprung from party government, whatever injustice has been caused by the excess of party feeling, the results of the existence of parties have been, on the whole, vastly beneficial. — It is hard to imagine how popular liberty and free government could be maintained without them, and it is the duty of the citizen, in regard to all great political matters, to belong to one party or another. There is little sympathy due to the “non-partisan” citizen at large, whose non-partisanship, boast he never so loudly of it, is too often but a cloak for indolence, which prevents him examining into and making up his mind upon the great questions which arise; or for indifference, or sometimes even for cowardice and self-seeking. There is much to be said in favor of the old Athenian law, which punished severely the man who, in times of public tumult and threatened overturn of the government, took neither one side nor the other; punished not the man who espoused the unsuccessful side, as an enemy of the people, after the fashion of a Roman proscription; not the man who joined the insurrection, as a rebel; not the man who attempted to uphold a falling power, as an instrument of tyranny and oppression; but the man who stood aside, ready to submit to either party, but who raised no hand to exalt either, or to put down either.

— Party, properly conducted, is a great educator; it is more—
— from its organization it gives to men, capable of serving the public in high station, opportunity to demonstrate their ability.

The opposition of parties insures the presentation of both sides of any question of public moment; it insures the existence of an organized body of men, active and united in the maintenance of those rights, belief in which enters into the party creed, and interested in making their fellow-citizens take an interest in what interests themselves; and, in various ways, compels persons who otherwise would be listless and careless of public matters, to at least hear about them, and probably to judge and to act with reference to them. A republic in which party feeling is dead is on the verge of decay and destruction itself; and furthermore, where questions upon which parties may be properly formed are involved (and from this category should be excluded everything which has not its foundation in a belief that the enforcement of a principle or the carrying out of a policy is for the public good), the dogma, "Principles, not men" should be unhesitatingly accepted. In parties, and for the sake of party, it often becomes the duty of the good citizen to lay aside personal predilections, to suppress personal preferences, to stifle personal resentment, and while, under no circumstances, is he justified in doing or conniving at what is wrong, or dishonest, or dishonorable, he may often be required to accept a compromise which is distasteful to himself and, if he cannot, through his party, accomplish all he would in what he considers the right direction, to accept what he can obtain, and patiently bide the time, waiting and working within party lines until the day when his hopes may be gratified, and his objects fully accomplished, and for the present to solace himself with the reflection *Quadam est prodire tenus, si non ultra debat.*

The difference between being willing to take what can be obtained and to wait, and insistence upon an immediate fulfillment of a political end, is often what, in great part, constitutes the difference between a statesman and a mere enthusiast. Cavour was none the less the patriot and the father of Italian unity, because in 1859 at the treaty of Villafranca, when Italy failed to obtain the enfranchisement of both the northern states from the Austrian rule, he assented to a peace which freed Lombardy while it left Venetia still in the possession of the stranger.

But party government has its limits. A battlefield wide as the empyrean is reserved for the contests of party, but such a field befits only giants, and giants should contend only about things great, high, majestic in themselves. The Titans might well, consistently with the law of their being, strive with Jove for the possession of Olympus, and Jove might well use his thunderbolts to defend such a possession, but what would have been thought of the Titans had they interfered in the contest of the frogs and mice, or what would we have thought had Jove used his bolts to knock down shellbarks from a hickory tree?

Parties must be formed upon great principles, and, in support of those principles, the good citizen may even follow the lead of one whose private character he cannot respect, so long as he is assured that such person will be loyal to the principles or carry out the policy of the party to which the citizen belongs, and it must be an extreme case, although perhaps such a case may arise, which will justify him in voting even for a good man, whose very excellency will be used the more effectually to subvert the principles which the voter believes to be true.

We may well agree with Burke when he defines party as "a body of men united for promoting by their joint endeavors the national interest upon some particular principle upon which they are all agreed," and further indorse with these limits his words: "Every honorable connection will avow it as their first purpose to pursue every just method to put the men who hold their opinions into such a condition as may enable them to carry their common plans into execution with all the power and authority of the state. As this power is attached to certain situations, it is their duty to contend for these situations. Without a proscription of others they are bound to give to their own party preference in all things, and by no means for private considerations to accept any offer of power in which the whole body is not included; nor to suffer themselves to be lead, or to be controlled, or to be overbalanced in office or in council, by those who contradict the very fundamental principles on which their party is formed and even those upon which every fair connection must stand."

The realm in which party fealty rules, as of right, does not, however, include the region of things which cannot be questioned of political principle; which are at most questions of mere local business policy, of business ability, of common honesty, and such are, principally, one might almost say, exclusively, the questions which arise in modern municipal governments. The questions are not properly of a political character at all. No wonder here some classicist may interpose with a reminder that *polis* means a city, and that politics with the Greeks meant the affairs of the city. Admit this, but is the modern city the ancient city? Are their constitutions identical or even similar? Are their powers the same or even alike? Are the affairs discussed in the assembly and the acts passed by the governing body of a modern city, whether it be a town meeting or a council, and which affect the city, the same as the affairs discussed in and acts passed by the governing body of the ancient city, and which affected it? Most emphatically, NO. The ancient city was the state—the nation. There was in Greece no central power, no nation, as we understand it, not even a permanent union or federation of states; but cities came together for a limited period, from time to time, when a common danger threatened, when that danger passed, the bond snapped and the cities became again rivals and enemies, each to itself the state, and, although a common religion and participation in the same great religious festivals supplied a bond of sentiment and made the Greek look upon Hellenes, though not of one race, as favored by the gods above the non-Hellenic races, they did not prevent war between the cities or in any way lead to the creation of a power superior to the city. One city might indeed, become tributary, through conquest or otherwise, to another city, but the city was still the state. The modern city is a corporation of limited powers, created by the mandate of a superior legislature, by which its rights have been granted, defined, and by which it may be deprived of those rights except so far as the legislature is restrained by the constitution, which itself, however, may be changed by the people of the state at large, and so the city be deprived of even constitutional rights.

In the ancient city the citizen had to pass, whether in the *Prnyx*, or in the *comitia*, or in the assembly, upon questions of foreign policy, of peace or war, of the enactment of laws of property, of the extension or restriction of the rights of suffrage or office-holding; he had to elect not only those who should administer justice and preserve order within the city, but also those who should represent her abroad, command her armies and her navies, make treaties of peace and commerce. Does the modern citizen when he acts, either in town meeting, or through his delegate in councils, pass upon such questions? Does he not rather decide whether he shall have concrete, or Belgian block, or cobblestone, or rubble pavement on his streets? Whether they shall be lighted with gas or with electricity? Whether an additional reservoir is needed to insure, to the good people of his town, a sufficient supply of water? How many clerks he will allow a particular public officer to employ, and how much they shall be paid? And (the greatest question of all) what particular kind of public conveyance, controlled by private power and for private profit, he will permit to occupy his streets?

Does the citizen, acting as stated in the modern municipality, select generals, foreign ambassadors, or those who shall make laws upon great moral subjects, those who shall determine the relations of his city with all the world, whose unwise action may bring upon the city war and disaster, or whose wise and conciliatory measures may cause its harbors to be filled with foreign shipping and its streets crowded with strangers seeking to purchase its manufactures? No. The officers he selects are to see that deeds are correctly and with reasonable promptness copied into books; that writs are handed to whomsoever may purchase them; that the writs are served; that property taken on execution be sold by a competent auctioneer; that taxes are assessed at a proper amount to defray the municipal expenses; that those taxes, when assessed, are collected; that coal is shoveled into a retort that it may come out gas, be passed through a purifier and made fit for illuminating purposes; that firemen be employed and properly drilled and disciplined to

preserve buildings from destruction by fire ; that a police force be maintained to guard the peace of the city from the nocturnal brawler and burglar, and to pursue and capture the law-breaker. The questions submitted, the matters considered, the offices elected, have not to do with political affairs, taking *polis* in its proper sense when used to express a government, namely, the state ; they have to do with municipal affairs in the modern sense, that is, with affairs which are highly important in that they bear upon the internal peace and good order of a city and the comfort, health, and happiness of the dwellers there, but have nothing whatever to do with the relations of the city or state to the world at large, or with the policy of the superior legislature from which the city derives its power. This seems too plain for argument. Yet there are people who will persist in proclaiming by their actions, if not by their words, that there is no difference between the election of a constable and that of the president of the United States, and who regard the loss of one office equally with that of the other as a party defeat ; who make no difference between the disaster in one case and the other but only of degree and not of kind.

Now, what possible difference can it make to us or to the public, when we go to the office of the recorder of deeds, whether the man who copies our deeds be a Democrat, or a Republican, or a Prohibitionist, or a Populist, provided he write a fair copy and give the deed back to us in a reasonably clean condition within a reasonable time ? What difference does it make whether the man who oversees a job of street paving be a Democrat, or a Republican, or a Prohibitionist, or a Populist ? What we want is a man who will see that the foundation of a street is laid according to the contract and according to law, that the pavers drive home with energy the superjacent surface and make them firm. And when a brave fireman risks his life in entering a burning house that he may save the lives of his mates, or drags his hose up a ladder that he may thereby effectually direct its stream against the devouring element, or checks its ravages, do we ask, before giving way to feelings of admiration or breaking out into applause, what are his po-

or the politics of the superior officer by whom he is directed, or of the head of the department to which he belongs?

Yet there are men who will say that on account of the party it is necessary, or it is fitting, that all the officers charged with the performance of duties of the character just mentioned should be selected from among the persons of the particular political belief which they themselves happen to hold; that it is necessary for the party to control the appointment of the clerks, of the recorder or the register, the commissioners or inspectors of highways, the firemen, the police. Men seem actually to think, and practically do require, that a person must hold sound tariff or sound money principles, or be a believer in centralization, or in local self-government, or at least profess to belong to the party holding such principles, before he can be permitted to copy a deed, sell a writ, or arrest a pickpocket. And the people who practically teach and practice this doctrine have the actual support of the majority of the community; the actual support, I say, although many give it unconsciously, and would shrink from an expressed declaration of adherence to so monstrous a doctrine if put forth in plain, naked exposure.

How has this come to pass? Certainly not from anything inherent in the nature of the offices to be filled, but primarily from the fact that the people, through negligence, have lost sight of the distinction which exists between offices of different kinds; have neglected to discriminate between their functions, and, because offices of vastly different character are, speaking generally, filled in the same way, by the same method of election or appointment, although by different constituencies, have come to regard an office simply as an office, and, carelessly, to apply a rule perfectly applicable to the filling of one office to another with which it, of right, has nothing to do. This negligence of the people is taken advantage of, this lack of discrimination is encouraged, by the politician of the less philosophical sort, who regards party as simply a means to obtain power and emolument, and not as the instrument to be used solely for the public good, and so its evil results are magnified; but the origin, that which renders it possible for the baser politician to obtain his

advantage, is the confusion, the result of indolence, in the of the voter.

Of the evil results of the confusion which exists, one hardly speak. But yet they will bear a little consideration.

The results of this confusion affect us harmfully, both in domain of politics, properly so-called, and in the domain of municipal affairs.

They affect us in the first, for they bring into the realm of national politics matters and considerations which have no business there, and so they obscure the political view, and sometimes, even cause a false report to be given by the electors which concern politics properly. If a certain party in a certain place controls the municipal offices, the municipal police, the municipal contracts, as such party, it may, if it will, draw to itself persons who simply seek their own profit or their own local advancement, and will cause them to enroll themselves as members of one or the other national party, vote its ticket, support by their votes its measures and policy, although they have no belief whatever in the principles of that party, or perhaps know nothing at all of them, so that we may have one shouting for protection, another may be made deputy sheriff, and another for free trade, and another may become the foreman of a hose company! Now, it is manifest that votes so given to a great national party really count for nothing, when considered as an expression of the people's thought, and yet they count, and so we may have conceived an apparent majority in national matters for a policy which in reality does not meet the approval of the greater number of citizens.

Again, this confusion of ideas, this carrying into practice the thought that all offices should be filled according to the political views of their holders, renders possible and even a dangerous form of corruption known to politicians as *spoils politics*, which has more than once been the means of defeating the will of the people.

If people were not in the habit of voting for federal officers and for congressmen, and for purely municipal officers and

same party appellation, it is not likely that an organization whose sole claim to the allegiance of its members and followers is that they belong to the same party, would be able to turn its following bodily into the enemy's camp upon a question of national moment, in return for a similar service rendered by that enemy in the matter of the municipal election. Unless it professed party principles, such an organization could not exist—it could not attract followers. The time has, fortunately, not yet come when an association, organized for the avowed purpose of obtaining municipal offices for its members and parceling out among them municipal patronage, can command any popular support; it must, therefore, either be an exponent of party principles, or must masquerade as such, and, having obtained a following, it may then establish such a discipline that its leaders may cast the votes of the association and its following in accordance with their own selfish views, but if the filling of municipal offices were in popular estimation distinct from federal politics, how could the stupidest voter be persuaded that it was good for the party to lose a federal election, to lose a congressman, when the party got nothing in return in the way of a partisan city or county officer? Just as it is impossible to establish commercial relations between two countries, when one has nothing to give to the other in return for its products or manufactures, so political trading would become impossible because there would be nothing to trade with. This is not the case now, and it is currently believed that what is known as political trading has in the history of this country taken place, to the corruption of the ballot and, sometimes, with the effect of causing an election to result very differently from what it would have done, had the electors considered simply, and by itself, the political question which was submitted for their decision.

But from another point of view the confusion of party and municipal matters has been productive of evil, in that the confusion prevents the municipality from obtaining the best service in the conduct of its business.

What should be the qualifications of a municipal officer? Simply that he should be able to do effectually the work of the

office in which he is placed, and that he should do it. As between two men, either of whom is willing to take a place which requires a certain kind of work, a reasonable man would naturally take the competent rather than the incompetent man; he would be thought a fool should he act otherwise. If both men were competent, although one was superior to the other, the employer might possibly, for personal reasons, be led by favoritism, or by a whim, to take the inferior, always provided he were competent, but further than this no reasonable man would go. Should not this be the rule in the selection of a municipal servant? But how is it now? It is thus: A and B are nominated by their respective parties for, say, city solicitor. A is an accomplished lawyer, a profound scholar, an eloquent orator, a man of unblemished character, of untiring industry, of the highest moral worth. B is a man of very ordinary professional attainments; while he has never done anything which can be laid hold upon by the law, he is known to have been not overscrupulous in his professional life, and is regarded with scant respect by his brethren at the bar; but he is a very shrewd politician (using the word in its lower sense) and by a series of artful maneuvers has prevented C, a much superior man, from obtaining the nomination of his party, and has obtained it for himself. If, as a private man, I were going to retain counsel, I should not hesitate for a moment between A and B. I should feel that in the hands of one my case was safe, that in those of the other it might be lost through incompetence, and I start for the polls, recognizing the fact that the city ought to have the best counsel she can get; that her affairs are of great importance, and require men of high attainments for their transaction; also that the city would be better served by A than by B, and feeling rather inclined to vote for him. But I am stopped. Hold, what are you going to do? A does not belong to our party, he belongs to the other. Will you betray our party? Will you give to the great national cause it represents a setback by the defeat of its candidate B? True B is inferior to A. We are very sorry B is not better, and we are sorry that C was not nominated, and we wish A belonged to

But what of that, A does not belong to us ; down with him ! "Principles, not men"! Ah, that great saying, but how abused time after time in its application ! As said Madame Roland on the guillotine : "O, Liberty ! how many crimes are committed in thy name !"

So I vote for B and reject A, and others do likewise, and so the city instead of being served by a competent man puts its affairs in the hands of an inferior one. Now, this is no fancy picture, and the insistence on the holding of particular party views as a condition of rendering service to the municipality, is carried further than the time of choice at the polls, and lower down than the head of a department. It is not many years since in the city of Philadelphia a lawyer of very great ability, familiar with the city's business, energetic, devoted to his work, assiduous in the study of his cases, powerful in argument before the court, popular with his professional brethren and with the public, who held the position of a chief assistant city solicitor, offended by the position taken at Washington by the leaders of his party, dissented therefrom, and was promptly turned out of his office, when the matters about which he was employed were as much affected by his views with reference to the Emancipation Proclamation as they could have been by his opinion on the atmosphere of Jupiter or the truth of the nebular hypothesis. But the removal took place ; it was demanded ; it was heartily approved in certain quarters, and by intelligent men— by men, who, if the gentleman in question had been retained by them in one of their own causes, would have regarded his retirement from it as something fraught with disaster to their interests and to be prevented by all reasonable means.

This matter seems so plain that one is almost ashamed to speak of it ; to dwell on it seems almost an affront to the reader and an advertisement of the stupidity of the writer who thinks so trite a matter needs urging home. Yet, plain, trite, as it is, let us look about us, and we see the practice of this community about the time of the election of municipal officers, and in dealing with the appointees of such officers when elected, to be just what has been described.

The evil does not stop here. Not only does the confusion of which we complain make easy the choice of the inferior in place of the superior for office, but it often prevents the municipality from receiving even the best work of which those chosen to office or given position for mere political reasons are capable. What is the requirement for continuance in office? Faithful public service only? Oh no! something must be added to it—the party organization must be served as well as the public. The officer must take his appointments from his own party; he must make from his salary contributions to party funds; he must do party work; if an inferior officer, he must belong to his ward or division committee, he must canvass his division, in some cases he may be held responsible to the party chief for the vote cast by that division. Now, this is all wrong; it is unjust to the employee, it is unjust to the public; it interferes with the work. A public employee is engaged to do a certain definite work. It is a wrong to the public if the time that belongs to it be taken from its work that the official may perform partisan services; if, for instance, when the citizen goes to the sheriff's office upon business in business hours, he finds that the sheriff is in attendance upon a party conclave, or that his deputy is engaged in going through his ward to "set up" delegates. It is unjust to the employee if he be required by those who control patronage and within whose gift lies office and position, to devote his time out of office hours to party work as the price of retention in his place. If he choose of his own free will to do party work in his own time, of course he has a right to do so, but it is an outrage to bring to bear upon him inducement or compulsion, arising out of hope of promotion or fear of dismissal, to do party work, which if it were not called party work—work done for the advancement of party principles—many cases would not be done by the employee of whom it is demanded. I do not say that the leader or boss who exacts this work always requires it in the belief that it is for the advancement of party principles, the benefit of the country upon definite lines of public policy, but that the carrying of party in municipal matters puts him in a position to exact it under

plea of the good of party, when he would not dare to demand it boldly as personal service to himself, and enables the man from whom it is exacted to persuade himself that his service is to his party in support of principle—that he is a soldier doing service to his cause at the behest of his leader, and not a slave, or, at best, a hireling doing the will of a master. With this idea in his mind, it is no wonder that the public employee begins to regard his office not only as representing to him work to be done for the public, but as an instrument to be used for the advancement of his party, and so he comes to serve two masters, the public and the party organization, and oftentimes he serves the latter more zealously than the former.

Again, this confusion of offices, as we may call it, renders possible the exaction from municipal officers and employees of contributions to political funds, sometimes by way of assessment, sometimes by means of an apparently voluntary gift, the generous disposition of the contributor being quickened by an apprehension that should he not contribute he may find that he has acted in a manner tending very decidedly to his detriment. In fact, the voluntary contributor, if an office-holder, is very much in the position of the man in the story, possibly as old as Joe Miller, who was forced to turn volunteer.

Now of course political funds must exist; there are in a widespread campaign many things which cost money, for example, the printing and distribution of pamphlets; the hiring of halls for meetings; the personal expenses of speakers. I say the *personal expenses* of speakers, for I do not think any reputable man ought to receive pay from party organization for his services on the stump or political rostrum, from which, as a citizen, he attempts to persuade his fellow-citizens to adopt his principles, to follow in the course which he believes to be the true one; and I am glad to think that the number of paid political orators, hireling patriots, is much smaller than the newspapers would sometimes have us believe. But how should such funds be raised? Wholly by what are in truth voluntary contributions. The office-holder should not be compelled, or even be expected, to contribute to them, simply because he is an office-holder.

The salary paid to a city employee, generally speaking, is not too large; it is unjust to diminish it by a required contribution, yet this injustice is done, and the exaction of a contribution is rendered possible by the fact that the employee holds his office as a party man receiving a party reward—and the man who would indignantly spurn an attempt to wring from him a sum as a tribute or a bribe to an individual who claims to have procured for him his office, or to have power to insure his continuance therein or his dismissal therefrom, will promptly pay when the contribution is represented as for the party, and having paid, he will not trouble himself very much as to the use to which his money is to be put. So we see, arising from the same ultimate cause, not only the injustice to the office-holder, but other and serious evils—for it takes little thought to convince that the liberality of contributors may often cause to be overlooked slackness and want of efficiency in work, not to mention the fact that when the large number of office-holders in a great city is taken into consideration, a very brief calculation shows us that a very small contribution from each is all that will be necessary to raise that most portentous thing in a free country, a corruption fund, of no mean proportions.

/ So much then for the evils, which, of course, have been merely sketched, which result from the confusion of the provinces of politics in the proper sense, and of municipal affairs. What is the cure? The cure, like that of all deep-rooted evils which affect the body politic, must be sought not in mere statutes or ordinances, but in the force of public opinion. Hence the cure is to be found in the education of the people—the teaching of the distinction which exists between political and municipal matters—*qui bene distinguit bene docuit*—and when the distinction is once put well and fairly before the people, the work is well begun; when the people recognize and act upon the distinction, the work is done, the cure is accomplished. But this, simple as it sounds, is not the work of a day. The greatest reforms seem simple enough after they have been accomplished. After the people have recognized and established them, the only wonder seems that they were not sooner

carried to a successful termination, and yet, in many a case, the toil, the labor, the heart-breaking that it has cost to attain success! It was a little thing to give to the Roman plebs an officer who should have the power to forbid the passage of a law whose tendency was to oppress them, an officer who should be able not to originate law, but simply by his vote to prevent the further oppression and enslavement, under form of law, of the great mass of the Roman people, yet it was not until after fifteen years of galling oppression under the name of a republic, and the secession to the *Mons Sacer* that the reform was obtained and the tribune elected.

The reform of the British Parliament seemed simple and plain and right enough, after its adoption in 1832. It had merely deprived certain rotten boroughs of representation, reduced the representation of others in which it was in excess of their importance, and given representation to large and important constituencies which had been, up to that time, voiceless in the councils of the nation, and yet from the time of Pitt's repeated motions for reform in 1782, 1783, and 1785 to the adoption of the measure, was half a century.

So if it takes some time to accomplish the great task of getting our fellow-citizens to do what it seems so natural that they should do—look to the man rather than his party, in selecting a person to fill a mere municipal office—discouragement should not ensue. If the principle contended for be right, it must, in the long run, conquer.

"There are such harvests as all masters spirits
Reap, haply not on earth, but reap no less
Because the sheaves are bound by hands not theirs."

The people will see aright and do right some time. They will not always remain in blindness. They will not always thoughtlessly follow the behests or suggestions of the self-seeking, but they must have the truth kept before them, pressed home upon them; and, speaking for myself, I believe the education of the people to be the only cure for the evils resulting from the confusion which we deplore. I do not believe in the permanent good effect of any coterie or body of men, no matter

how pure in intention, how zealous in good works, its members may be, which will assume to dictate nominations to parties, recognizing them as such, or to say to one or the other, "nominate men whom we consider good, or we will throw our force, our might as an organization, against your candidates, or put candidates of our own in the field." Such a body has, of course, a right to exist; organized for a temporary purpose, for a special emergency, it may and often does produce a temporary good; it may tide over a peril; but I do not believe that by a long continued existence it can be productive of permanent, lasting good, even if it should attract to itself such a following that it holds the balance of power between the two great political parties. Its very corporate existence would present it before the eyes of the selfish office-seeker as something to be conciliated by him for his own purposes, as something which might be cajoled or tricked into his support, and it is very conceivable that a body having its origin in solicitude for the interests of purity and good government might be misled so far as to become, unwittingly, a tool for the advancement of unworthy men. It would be difficult to preserve such a coterie pure when once it had shown that it possessed power; membership in it would be sought for improper purposes, as a means of individual promotion; and, besides all this, such a body has a natural tendency to become self-sufficient and arrogant, even assuming to dictate to the people, and to brand them as ingrates for refusing to submit to dictation. Now, it is a well established fact that the people will not long stand dictation unless you appeal to them to submit thereto in the name of party fealty, and then it is remarkable how much they will stand.

But, while such an organization as has been indicated is of no permanent value, organizations of the proper sort may be of the greatest imaginable service to the community in assisting in the establishment of independence in voting for municipal offices; but they must be organizations which will educate the people in the underlying principle upon which such independence must rest; which will work with the people and not over them; which will open the doors of membership wide to the people

and will disclaim firmly any right to restrain the individual independence of the citizen when once he has become a member. By such an organization much can be done to rouse the people to the insistence upon reform, and without doubt the people can be roused to demand a reform. We have had a very striking proof of this in the recent forcing by the people of the enactment of a ballot act from a legislature (*i. e.*, that of Pennsylvania) a majority of whose members were opposed to the principles upon which the bill rested, but who were forced to yield to the pressure of a public opinion, which had been brought about by the constant, steady presentation to the people of the excellencies of the system which they were asked to indorse. What intelligent presentation has done in one instance, it may do in another. Therefore, let there be kept constantly before the people, in season and out of season, this fact: A municipal officer is one who is to serve you in a business capacity, not one who is to make laws or determine a policy for the state or for the union.

We have seen great reforms accomplished in our day—reform in the civil service, reform in the ballot—so let us hope that before long we may hail the achievement of another reform, which, acting upon the hearts and minds of the voters of the community, will bring it to pass that they will no longer choose their municipal servants because they are of one political party or of the other, but because they seem to be the most fit men presented for the voters' choice, to do the work which the city requires to be done in the offices to be filled, and that the time will come when the consistent party man—the unselfish man who would make real sacrifices to advance those political principles which he holds almost as a part of his religion, to abandon which would be for him an act of base, arrant cowardice, to compromise which would be for him an act of dishonesty—may yet, when he comes to a municipal election, vote, if he will, for a political opponent whom he believes the candidate most worthy of his choice, without having to justify his conduct to any one, and when no one will ever dream that such conduct needs justification.

HENRY BUDD.

THE INSANE AND HOSPITALS FOR THEIR CARE.

BY ELIOT GORTON, FIRST ASSISTANT PHYSICIAN, STATE HOSPITAL
FOR THE INSANE, MORRIS PLAINS, N. J.

IN THE time of the ancient Greeks, temples were built in which all persons, even criminals who were in danger of their lives from any cause, could flee and obtain refuge from their pursuers. These places were called *asulon*, a literal translation being "inviolable, unharmed," and were regarded as sacred places which it was a sacrilege to disturb. Hence it is that we derive our word "asylum," which has come to be applied to charitable institutions in general and institutions for the insane in particular.

Inasmuch as institutions for the insane are far beyond such conception, it is gratifying to note the gradual abolition of the word "asylum," as applied to these institutions, and the substitution of the word "hospital."

This is in the line of progress and a fitting tribute to the memory of those who have devoted their lives to the care of the insane and the advancement of our knowledge concerning their treatment. We have outgrown the term, and let us hope that the time is not far distant when it will become altogether obsolete. The word was not originally designed for, nor applied to, institutions for the insane, as has been seen, but has been evolved in the last fifty years, or we may say, from the day that Pinel, the celebrated French physician and humanitarian, struck the chains from those who were thought to be mad or "possessed by a devil," and conclusively proved to the world that such treatment as had been previously practiced was barbarous and inhuman. And let us not forget Esquirol, who so nobly aided in the good work, for from him our present system of caring for the insane has emanated.

The institutions of to day are mostly hospitals in the true sense of the word—hospitals where the mentally diseased and afflicted may have the benefit of the best scientific treatment, at the hands of those who have spent their lives in the study of morbid psychological conditions.

Hospitals for the insane during the past decade have been afflicted with more than their share of adverse criticism and abuse. In many instances almost irreparable injury has been done by the loss of public confidence which such criticisms have entailed, for, whether it be justly or unjustly, no institution can have discredit thrown upon its management, or its officials, without creating a certain amount of suspicion and distrust in the community.

Therefore, there is no subject, perhaps, which comes so near to the hearts of the people as the care of the insane. This is evinced by the artistic and commodious buildings which have been erected in every state for the care—custodial care if need be—and cure of those who are so unfortunate as to be mentally afflicted. I am considering state hospitals only—the institutions which have been provided by a generous people for the care of their indigent insane. Private institutions are far more numerous, and many of them are more luxurious in their appointments, because they must necessarily cater to the tastes of the wealthy. It by no means follows, however, that private institutions are to be preferred to public ones, so far as medical treatment is concerned.

A state hospital for the insane consists of one large building, or a group of smaller buildings. If the former, the executive part of the building is in the center, and from each side of it the male and female wings branch off in opposite directions, which entirely separates them from each other. If the latter, the buildings are so located as to be easily and quickly accessible from the administration building, in which are the offices and in which live those in charge. Each ward is classified and numbered. In all states these institutions are under the control of a board of managers or trustees, whose duty it is to appoint executive officers, to see to it that the internal affairs are

properly and economically conducted, and to adjust all existing differences. With three exceptions, all such institutions in the United States are in the immediate charge of a medical superintendent, on the ground that as these institutions are built and maintained exclusively for the care and treatment of the insane, physicians of experience in psychological medicine should be at their head. He alone is responsible to the board of managers for a clean, effective administration. Subject to his directions is a staff of assistant physicians who have the immediate care and supervision of all the patients, and a steward who attends to the proper care of the grounds, buildings, supplies, etc.

In New Jersey, however, the two state hospitals, one at Trenton, the other at Morris Plains, are conducted on what is known as the "dual management." Under this form of government the medical and business departments are completely separated. The official title of medical superintendent becomes that of medical director, while the steward becomes a warden. The medical director has the sole charge of the wards, the patients, and all things relating thereto, while the warden has the care of the buildings, grounds, farms, etc., and is responsible for the finances and economical administration of affairs. Each head of a department is individually responsible to the board of managers for the proper management of his respective department.

The hospital for the insane at Norristown, Pa., is under a triple form of government. This is identical with the dual system, with the exception that a female physician has exclusive control of the department for female patients.

The managers of the various institutions are appointed by the governor of the state, and the board usually consists of from seven to ten members. It is intended that they shall be evenly divided as to their political sentiments, in order to eliminate that disturbing element, politics, as much as possible from the management.

However, when any institution is so unfortunate as to have politics become an important factor in the administration of its affairs, and when the officials are changed every time there is a change in the political complexion of the state government, the

usefulness of such an institution is seriously impaired, if not ruined. Why? Because no physician of any repute would accept a position on the staff of such a hospital, knowing that he would be at the mercy of a change in politics, with the chances in favor of his removal at a time when his usefulness to the institution and personal interest in his work had become established. It cannot be denied that men trained in a special line of work are more useful than the unskilled. If any rule of management should obtain other than efficiency, positions would be filled with a class of men who, knowing that their terms of office would be of short tenure, would look after the emoluments rather than the unfortunates whose welfare should be their first care.

Therefore, if the welfare of the patients were consulted, there would be no changes in the medical staff of a hospital for the insane, except in the interest of efficiency. If one will look over the annual reports of the majority of the hospitals for the insane in the United States, where politics does not enter into the management, he will find that in many no changes have been made in the staff for years. These are the hospitals which will be found to have more than a national repute, and of which the citizens are justly proud. If the people at large could be educated to their responsibilities in such matters, and could be brought to realize that *the patients in the institutions* are the ones who suffer from political mismanagement, they would demand that all state hospitals for the insane be rigidly barred from the canker of political influence.

It is a common belief that in all state institutions of this character there are numberless "fat" positions which may be distributed by politicians among their constituents, on the principle that "to the victors belong the spoils." As a matter of fact, official positions (and they are few) are underpaid, the service rendered far exceeding the pecuniary compensation received; and no one except he has had practical experience can appreciate the endless round of work, medical and otherwise, which entails upon those in charge.

From the foregoing it is evident that the wiser course for any

governing board to pursue is to select men for their ability and fitness for this special line of work, giving them such compensation as would tend to retain their services. Unfortunately, in a few states, the positions are filled more or less by political favor, and men are selected not from any fitness, but for their political "pull." This fact, more than any other cause, has tended to shake the confidence of the public in the integrity of all such charitable institutions, and to deprecate the work of conscientious officials.

Politics as yet, however, plays no part in the management of the vast majority of state institutions in the appointment of their officers, and it is to be hoped that the time is coming when motives higher than the merely political will bear rule in the management of *all* institutions for the care of the sick and insane.

A state hospital for the insane is governed, then, so far as its inmates are concerned, by a medical head and a staff of assistant physicians. The number of assistants varies, but usually depends upon the number of patients, and for effective work there should be at least one physician to every two hundred patients. The assistant physicians make a tour of their respective wards twice daily, and oftener if occasion requires, during which they see and converse with their patients, and acquaint themselves with their peculiarities and mental condition. Observing them closely day by day, a trained man will quickly note changes in a patient's mental condition which would be overlooked by a novice.

Another duty which falls to the lot of the assistant physician is the daily dispatching of patients' mail. In regard to this there is so great a prejudice or misunderstanding that, in New York State, laws have been enacted regulating this matter. There seems to be a popular fallacy that all letters written by the insane undergo a rigid scrutiny, and if they contain anything which reflects in any way upon the institution, its officers or its management, they are withheld or consigned to the waste paper basket. I desire to most emphatically emphasize the fact that such is not the case. While there are obvious reasons

examining such mail matter, it should be stated that it is done in the interest of the public and the friends of the patients.

Insane persons will often express delusions and present other evidence of insanity in letters, which they will never allude to in conversation, because they are often suspicious of questioning, and are cunning enough to conceal their morbid impressions. One or more of such letters are usually preserved, and form valuable adjuncts to the clinical records of these patients. There is another class of patients whose letters are of such a character as to be unmailable, if the postal laws are to be respected. Should such letters be mailed, infinite grief and sorrow would be caused to their anxious relatives and friends.

Still another class spend their time writing to well-known public personages, such as the president of the United States, governors of states, mayors of large cities, and others. Letters to George Washington, Napoleon Bonaparte, Christopher Columbus, and many other celebrities who long ago passed to their eternal rest, are still being written.

Many of the insane have a mania for writing to prominent firms in response to their advertisements, ordering large quantities of their commodities. In a few instances they have succeeded in mailing such letters outside and causing the hospital authorities much annoyance and vexation. Most important of all, perhaps, are those letters written during a period of excitement. Numberless times has the writer received the thanks and gratitude of convalescing patients for withholding letters which, had they been mailed, would have been a source of great mortification and anxiety to them.

It can now be readily appreciated that such oversight of mail matter is not only necessary, but very important, and were it dispensed with serious complications would ensue. Incoming letters for patients are never opened but are delivered direct. Packages, however, are opened, a record made of their contents, and matches, candles, knives, medicines, and other dangerous articles sent by fond relatives are withheld. It is, indeed, a very important matter that such supervision be constantly exercised, for there are countless patients who would be at no

loss to know what to do with matches, candles, and the like, should they be unfortunate enough to obtain them, or their attendant should in any way give opportunity for their use. Here it is that "eternal vigilance is the price of safety," and one single omission might prove disastrous.

Patients soon learn to regard their physician as a friend. He gains the confidence and esteem of those who are in any way capable of appreciating their surroundings and the relation which he holds to them, and this class comprises perhaps two thirds of the insane.

It will be seen, therefore, that frequent changes in the medical staff of any hospital for the insane are not only unwise, but often a source of detriment and injury to the proper service of the hospital. It is no light task for one to acquaint himself with the peculiarities of a few hundred patients; to be able to call them all by name; to be familiar with the course and progress of their disease; to know on what wards to place them, and to exercise judgment in those cases which are sane to-day and insane to-morrow.

It is a well-known fact that the laity regard the insane and their institutions with a feeling akin to dread. This feeling may be partly attributed to the mistaken impression which very generally prevails, that all insane persons are extremely dangerous and are always in a state of maniacal excitement. Nothing could be more absurd. That patients are maniacal times is true, but this stage of their malady is of brief duration. In many years experience with the insane, I have yet to see the "raving maniac" so vividly portrayed in many works of fiction. As a matter of fact, visitors are always amazed at the quietness, neatness, and order on the halls. They see the insane quietly conversing, or sewing, or playing games, or engaged in some light employment, and "wonder that they should be confined as they see nothing the matter with them." For the most part the disturbed halls, or so-called violent wards, are as quiet and orderly as could be desired. It was not long ago that I was called upon to conduct a visiting party through the hospital. They were escorted through every ward of the female department.

ment. On returning one of them said, "But, doctor, we want to see the violent patients." I assured him that he had seen every ward. "Yes," he replied, "but we want to see the dungeons and padded cells with their inmates." On being informed that we had no dungeons and that there was not a padded cell in the entire building, he expressed his astonishment and went his way firmly convinced that he had been deceived.

Here allow me to call attention to the matter of restraint. Despite all that has been written on this subject, the public cannot seem to realize the fact that restraint of the insane is a thing of the past. People still have vague ideas that the insane are tied, or chained, or put in "strait-jackets," and think, as a matter of course, that such treatment is necessary. They do not seem able to comprehend that a century has wrought many changes in the care of the insane. Restraint as formerly practiced is dead. We have no dungeons, no chains, no padded cells, no cribs. We ignore, when we can, the fact that our patients are insane, and try to treat them as rational human beings. The *camisole*, however, is still moderately in use. This consists of a canvas jacket with long, closed sleeves, which, while it is perfectly comfortable, confines the arms of a patient and prevents him from injuring himself or others. These are used in the few cases (about one half of one per cent) in which at times such restraint is imperatively demanded for obvious reasons. Even this amount of restraint would not be necessary did the service admit of detailing one or more nurses to each of such patients. As it is, there is usually an average of one nurse to every ten patients, and, except in cases of emergency, it is impracticable to increase the number. In private institutions which allow each patient his own special attendant no restraint is ever necessary.

In the majority of hospitals for the insane, the halls are emptied every pleasant day and the patients taken out, either in the inclosures provided for such purpose, or walking with their attendants, except, of course, the acutely ill. A few have parole. That is, they have the privilege of walking out at their

pleasure within certain hours, without an attendant, on certain conditions, one of which is that they are not to leave the hospital grounds. This is a privilege which is highly appreciated by those who enjoy it, and the conditions are rarely violated. The fact that they are trusted, that they are put upon their honor, seems to imbue them with the feeling that the confidence reposed in them shall not be misplaced. Amusement for the insane has become a prominent feature in their treatment, and it must be conceded that any form of amusement which tends to detract their attention from self, which serves to dispel the gloom in which so many are enshrouded, must be beneficial. The weekly dances, card parties, and other entertainments provided for the insane, are usually models of propriety and decorum, and attended to the full capacity of the hall. It is sometimes difficult for visitors to believe that the well-behaved participants are insane and proper subjects for such care.

Beside the legitimate visits to patients from their relatives and friends, all hospitals for the insane are more or less afflicted with visits from the curious. As the majority of state institutions are always open for public inspection within reasonable hours, except on Sunday, these cannot be excluded. They act as though they think the insane, by virtue of their insanity, have either lost the sense of hearing, or are in some degree able to understand and appreciate remarks made in their presence, and will often ask pertinent questions relative to a patient's mental condition in his hearing. Patients resent nothing more than this, and the turbulent will occasionally attempt to terrorize such visitors, and laugh about it afterwards as a good joke. Such a patient once said to me: "I thought I was a wild animal in a cage, so I thought I'd show them how one would act." While, as a rule, patients pay no attention to these visitors, many speak of it, and resent the inference that they are on public exhibition.

In regard to many stories of abuse which patients claim to have received at the hands of their attendants, the mass of them should be accepted cautiously, as they are often the creation of a disordered mind and the natural outgrowth of certain d

sions. Some are absolutely without foundation, and of these many are said with malicious intent. Others, I regret to say, are founded on fact. No matter how careful a superintendent may be in selecting nurses for the insane, it occasionally happens that one, aggravated beyond endurance by a troublesome patient, will forget that the subject for complaint is legally not accountable for his acts, and take the matter into his own hands. It is but just to say that no unkindness or abuse from attendants toward their patients is tolerated for a moment by the management. It has been thought wise and in the interest of good service to remove nurses who do not seem to be suited to their occupation, as evinced by numerous little complaints from their patients. This is a matter which is never lost sight of by hospital authorities. Any nurse against whom there is even the suspicion of such unfitness is removed. Those who are discharged for any such cause find it difficult to obtain employment in other hospitals, since they are notified of such discharges. There is a constant weeding out, therefore, of poor material—the chaff from the wheat. Good nurses are difficult to obtain, and more difficult to retain, for the reason that they receive better remuneration for their services caring for private cases outside than state hospitals are willing to pay.

We so often hear the expression: "It is easy to get into a lunatic asylum, but extremely difficult to get out." This is but another straw in the wind of popular sentiment, showing the direction of its thought. How strange it is that in this age of enlightenment, people still cling to many of the relics of the age of superstition and ignorance. It is true that the entrance for proper cases to an "asylum" is easy, and dangerous patients find it a difficult matter to get out. Yet, as a rule, the relatives of patients find no difficulty in obtaining their "release from bondage," providing the cases are those which are not a menace to the safety of the community in which they live. It is often a more difficult matter to have patients committed for treatment, especially those cases in which the disease is slow and insidious in its invasion and the patient is known to be insane, not by any one act or saying, but by a totality of symptoms and

a comparison of his present state with what he was a short time previously. No one class of persons more than physicians recognize the fact that all are liable to err, and many will not assume the responsibility of committing a patient to an institution for the insane unless he manifests unmistakable symptoms of insanity. For this reason many dangerously insane persons are at large who will never be incarcerated until their delusions prompt them to some deed of violence.

For the sake of argument, let us admit that a few patients are confined who are not sufficiently insane to warrant being deprived of their liberty, or who are not insane and, to accept the theory of fiction (I have never seen such a case), are sent away by designing relatives who desire their possessions. If they come properly committed, the hospital authorities are bound to receive and detain them. But they would be kept under careful observation *only* for a sufficient length of time to enable one to say that they were not fit subjects for care, when they would be released. Bear in mind that an insane person possessed of property cannot be deprived of such without a hearing before a court and jury. If such person is declared to be insane, the court appoints a guardian, who attends to the legal administration of his affairs. Legislation has thrown every conceivable safeguard around this unfortunate class for the protection of their interests, and no one can be deprived of his inalienable right without a compliance with legal forms.

The trial before a lay jury of cases alleged to be insane is a matter for legislative reform. The *principal* is right, but the *system* as practiced at present is radically wrong—a travesty upon justice, a miserable farce. How absurd it is to ask a body of men who are ignorant of the first principles of medical jurisprudence, and whose only conception of an insane man is that he must “rave,” to decide upon the mental condition of a person who has been declared insane, perhaps by those who have made the study of mental diseases a life work, and whose opinions are entitled to respect. The two following instances of many which have come under my observation are pertinent to the subject: I was called upon to testify to the insanity of a

young lady whose parents had died. The proceedings were friendly and for the purpose of having a guardian appointed to look after her share of the estate. She was, and had been for about two years, an inmate of a hospital for the insane, and there was no question as to her insanity. For obvious reasons she was not present at the trial. The evidence laid before the jury by her brothers and other relatives, by the medical superintendent (a well-known alienist) in whose care she had been placed, by her family physician and myself, was convincing, and there was not a word of testimony in rebuttal. Yet, the jury brought in a verdict of "sanity." The second case, recently, was of similar import, though in this case the jury consisted of twenty-four men, and they insisted upon having the patient present. During the proceedings, the doctor took the stand and was questioned by the patient as follows: "Doctor, are you not systematically poisoning your patients? Is it not a fact that you put opium in the butter? Do you not put Paris green in the bread and horseradish in the coffee, and then give others medicine to counteract its effect, while I am made sick and am poisoned by it?" There were many other similar questions. The jury emptied the room of everyone but themselves and the patient, and spent half an hour in questioning him alone. They then sent him out of the room also, and deliberated for nearly two hours. While they finally brought in a verdict of "insanity," there were four of them who openly expressed a doubt of his insanity, and two absolutely refused to sign the verdict, declaring that there was nothing the matter with the man.

Either there should be a means of selecting a jury of sufficient intelligence to deal with matters of such importance, or such cases should be submitted directly to the court. Under the present system of juries *de lunatico inquirendo*, it is an extremely difficult matter to give society the protection it very justly claims from a most dangerous class of the insane—the paranoiac, commonly known as the delusional "crank."

However, judging from the advances which have been made in this direction in the past, we may hope for an ideal system in the near future.

ELIOT GORTON.

THE PLACE OF THE LABOR LEADER.

BY W. L. SHELDON.

IT HAS struck me that in the cause of social science we ought to make a study of the labor leaders as a class of men by themselves. They are coming to be a kind of *institution* in the modern world. They are certainly a recognized factor with which the business community is obliged to deal. We should investigate such men—not with the purpose either of sympathizing with them or denouncing them, but in order to appreciate their actual position. We need to decide just where they belong as factors in the present industrial *régime*. The vital consideration is to discover what rôle they are going to play in the future. The trouble is, nowadays, that most persons look at them from the side of emphatic sympathy or pronounced disapproval. When we take up a volume dealing with the matter, we usually know the writer's standpoint in advance. Somehow we are driven to think that he has written his book for a purpose, and we do not regard it as a purely scientific treatise. We cannot help looking askance at some of the few economists who have written on the subject within the last few years. They do not seem able to deal with the subject in that same unbiased, impersonal way with which they would deal with problems of finance. Possibly it is because there is so much at stake. Yet I see no other method open to us. It must be done. Society will have a great deal to do with such men as time goes on. Legislation must be enacted with reference to them. They themselves are seeking to be a factor in legislation.

The first essential is to know with what we are dealing. The real problem would be rather to determine what calls this class into existence; what encourages its members in their ambitions; in what special direction will their influence in the long run dis-

play itself. When a new institution begins to arise, the thing to do is not to attack it or encourage it—but to *study* it. We ask: Should not the economist investigate the labor leader, just as he would the problems of rent, interest, or of banking? Why not treat him simply as one of the phenomena of the modern industrial system, whose origin has to be explained and whose position has to be assigned in the domain of political economy? I have always taken toward these leaders the honest attitude of an inquirer. They have taught me a great deal. I admit to that much of a bias in their favor. They have had a certain kind of acquaintance with one special side of the world, which could not be acquired from books. Interviews and correspondence with such men, and opportunities of listening to them in this and other cities, have given me an impression of the labor leader which I never would have had from the bare study of ethical or economic science.

The labor leaders are unique figures. Nothing quite of the same type appears to have existed in earlier history. They are men with a distinct set of motives. In fact they are a feature of the new civilization and the new industrial system. It is most difficult to estimate their character. They come from the body of people whom they are endeavoring to influence, and, as a rule, they stay with the class from which they came. That is the secret of their power. They come personally in contact day and night with the elements which they want to control. They help to shape the sentiments in the vast understratum of society with which educated people rarely come in contact. By and by these sentiments are heard in our legislatures or in Congress. Then we begin to wonder whence they came. People begin to talk about "the voice of the people." But if we trace it back far enough we shall discover that it was rather "the voice of the labor leader."

There is no other way of studying the labor leader, of knowing what he is, where he comes from, and what will be his influence, save by studying the man himself. A great deal is said sometimes about watching "the voice of the people," analyzing the uprisings of the great working class. But when we look at

the matter closely we can see that at the start there is never a great uprising of a whole class. The mass of the people would go on in the same way indefinitely, were it not for the leadership of the few.

We have little appreciation from the outside, of the vast amount of time and effort devoted by the labor leaders to working up sympathy for a cause. Only a few men do the work. I venture to say from my observation that the movements of the laboring class in any large city are guided by a very small body of men. It is not a calm, deliberate sort of guidance. The leader does not issue his orders like an officer of an army. He receives no authority from headquarters. His word is obeyed only because by a long, slow process he has acquired a certain kind of influence. The people give him his authority, but he has really by his efforts created it himself. People from the outside can have a very dim notion how much work may be done by one of these leaders. There may be an eight-hour day for him in his trade. But it is often an eighteen-hour day of work for him as a labor leader.

Men like John Burns and Tom Mann of England, or Powderly and Gompers in this country, certainly have exerted a great deal of influence. They not only have extensive control over the actions of a large class of persons, but what is more, they have a great deal to do in shaping the economic views of the mass of the people. They are leaders, therefore, in both senses of the term. It is through the efforts of a few such men in every city, as well as in every country, that the laboring class has been organized into the form of trades unions.

When we speak of the natural unrest of the working class, we are using equivocal language. I do not think many persons would be impressed in that way, if they were to see the mass of the people when unorganized or without guidance. There may be a spasmodic outburst at times. But on closer inspection we shall be more and more struck with the natural lethargy of the body of the people. The "volcanic tongue of flame" burns in only a few hearts at a time. The inertia of the mass of the people oppresses me as something appalling. Instead of

wondering why they are not more active and aggressive, we are almost surprised when they do exert themselves. There are always a few who are ready to act. But humanity is not a tinder box.

The restless demand for change and reform is by no means so universal as many people would suppose. It appears more often in the early years of a working man, if it is visible at all. But the steady labor year after year checks the uneasy spirit. The responsibility for the family and the home may cool his ardor. He becomes more quick to accept little, rather than run the risk of losing everything. Human nature, after all, is instinctively conservative. As I watch the working class, it does not strike me that it is so universally disposed to agitate for a change of circumstances.

The labor movement, therefore, cannot, as a fact of history, be called an uprising of a whole class of people. It may become that in the end, but it does not start in that way. It takes its origin from the smoldering fire in the hearts of a few. It would be these few who build up the sentiment. Understand *them* and we understand the labor movement—because they *are* the labor movement.

This is why we appeal to the economists for a closer attention to the labor leader. They do study the movement itself. They devote chapters in their treatises to "trades unionism" and to the "social theories." They discuss the variations in wages and the possible limits to these variations. But we cannot help wishing that they would push their investigation further; that, in fact, instead of viewing it as a matter of wages or unionism, they would go to the source or the origin of the movement, in the leader himself. Trades unionism, or the social theories advocated by the working class, will depend for its failure or success on the efforts of this limited element. I honestly believe that if we were to eliminate a few hundred men from our large cities, or a few thousand from the whole country, there would be no labor movement in America. The same would also be true of Europe. The movement itself is represented by this one small class of persons. Instead of looking at

the tendency from the abstract, would we not get at it better by investigating the motives, character, and personalities of such men? Would it not be well if the treatises on economics devoted chapters not only to trades unionism, but to "analysis of the labor leader"?

Ought there not to be a class of students in economics who could make this study a kind of specialty, just as others devote themselves largely, if not exclusively, to the departments of finance or taxation. It would need to be a specialty, because the method of acquiring the knowledge would be so different from what would be used in those other departments. Such students would have to be keen judges of human nature. They would be obliged to make their observations from practical contact. As we have said, it would be as much a study of persons as of facts. But if we could have that special kind of knowledge worked out in great detail, it might give us a clue as to new methods of dealing with the labor problem. Under these circumstances, when legislation is tried, we could know somewhat in advance how much could be accomplished.

As was intimated, these labor leaders are becoming an important influence on the economic views of the people. This makes it all the more necessary that we should know more about them. It seems to me, every kind of effort ought to be made to bring them in closer touch with the leading specialists in political economy. This has been difficult, however, because the two classes of men come at their views in such a different way. The labor leaders take their start from the spirit of unrest, and not through a separate interest in economics. This fact dominates them straight through their career. They are workers first and students afterwards. They want their knowledge for this specific purpose. The subject itself in the abstract would not appeal to them. For this reason they never could have the scientific spirit. It is bound to give their opinions and utterances quite a different form from the opinions and utterances of other students of economics. This may be a matter of regret, but it has to be accepted as inevitable. It should always be taken into account in forming our impressions as to their views.

It is necessary to come at the minds of such men in a different way. What has originally convinced them of certain principles was not an elaborate process of argument. The dominating influence with them was a sense of dissatisfaction with present conditions. They are not seeking to discover an abstract law, but rather to find a method out of a difficulty.

In the second place, just as the causes which led them to become interested in such questions were peculiar to their conditions of life, so, on the other hand, they will be influenced by their own special kind of purpose or ambition. When they once set out in active work as leaders, their predominant motive must inevitably be, first to acquire an influence over their class. We may say to ourselves, "Why don't they stop and think." The answer would be, "Because they come at the subject in a different way." They do not set out with the purpose of becoming students. Strictly speaking, their profession is that of the reformer or agitator, and not that of the economist. Yet the serious consideration is that they are liable to become leaders of the masses of the people in this very sphere of political economy. The tendency is inevitably that they should *drift* into their peculiar standpoints on such problems, rather than come there after long reflection, and so be able to give complete reasons for their attitude. When they take hold of a question it is vital to them that they should have an immediate solution of some kind. They only become students *by the way*. It would be out of the question, therefore, to expect from them a philosophic consistency or completeness in their doctrines. It accounts for the fact that sometimes they appear to make utterances which seem very wild and out of accord with any kind of philosophy.

We call attention to these facts in reference to the labor leader because it seemed important in seeking to understand him and his true place. If we do not allow for this circumstance, we may go entirely wrong in our impression of such men. We might assume that they were necessarily insincere and had no regard for accuracy. In that case they would call for an altogether different treatment, both by the economist and

the legislator. But we must explain him, account for him before we legislate about him.

It is not simply a question of the special class of society from which he sprang, or how he took his start as a leader. It may be of great consequence whether he was born in this or some other country. The conditions of the age, the temperament of the race to which he has belonged, the institutions of the people among which he was born—all this will exert its influence. It will never do for us, therefore, to speak of these men as all of one class. If that were done, we should be utterly misled in seeking to interpret the labor leader. We might go altogether astray in our impressions with regard to him. There is as much difference among them as among any other body of men. Everything depends, for example, on whether they were born in this country. It even makes a great difference, if they come from Europe, what special country was their native place. The varying conditions develop marked differences of men and character.

We see it at once in their views as to methods for accomplishing their purposes. I recollect, for example, asking two different men whether they would undertake to effect their aims by amendments to the constitutions; that is to say, would they seek to use only legal methods in bringing about their reforms. One of the number was born in the east of Europe. We might say that he was without race, without country, without religion. He had lived and worked in Austria, Germany, and England as well as in several cities of the United States. His answer to my question was: "The way to amend the constitutions would be to abolish them all." That was terse and concise, as well as very expressive. The other leader, I believe, was a native-born citizen of this country. He advocated the same general social theory as the other, and in his way seemed equally radical. But his answer to my question was quite different. He said: "We should like to accomplish our methods as far as possible along the lines laid down by the founders of this commonwealth." The difference between these two men is that one was born in this country and the other on the continent.

Europe. I have been struck with this contrast again and again. It makes a great difference, in reference to the labor leader, where he passed his childhood and early life. This fact is of vital consequence when thinking of the influence of such men in America.

It is not only a question of difference in race, or birth, or conditions of life. The great problem for us would be to analyze the peculiar kind of influence which these men exert. We see them mostly from their aggressive attitude. We associate their efforts with strikes and boycotts—often, alas! with the use of violence. But it has to be remembered that we do not sit in their councils. We are not present at their discussions among themselves. The last act of a tragedy is often a very faint clue as to where it started. The climax may be anything but what was desired. It is often said that we are to judge men by their acts. That would certainly be just. Yet one act now and then gives but a most vague impression. When we stand outside, it is inevitable that we should remember only such conduct as was pronounced and aggressive. We may fail to appreciate the tremendous influence exerted in the way of mere restraint. The labor leader may be as often holding the people back as urging them forward. The great body of men rarely start an uprising of their own accord. Yet it does occur. There will come now and then a spasmodic outburst. When it is wild and unguided, it may be all the more terrible. The disclosures which are occasionally made sometimes show how desperately the leader may be trying to *hold the people back*.

An illustration of their influence in this direction came to me in reference to the anarchistic tendencies which have been visible here and there in this country and in Europe. There is no doubt that a leaning to such principles has been visible even in the working classes of America. Restlessness is liable to give expression to itself in defiance of law. It would be a theory toward which people could easily drift, and it requires constant checking. I recollect some time ago an occurrence in St. Louis. Mr. Powderly was to speak in the city. Naturally I availed myself of the opportunity to go and listen to him.

Scarcely any other person save the members of his own class came to the meeting. At one time he raised his hand, and in bold tones exclaimed: "Once for all, I wish it understood that we are done with the anarchists." It was a most impressive utterance. They received it in dead silence. He made his friends for his cause by saying it. In a way he only made his position more difficult. It seemed unfortunate that the public press did not quote the remark. They scarcely noticed the meeting. Yet what he said at that time was profoundly significant. I recognized what an influence the labor leader exerts in the way of bare restraint. It has struck me, in fact, that, as a body of men, they have been a great power in this country in keeping the working class from going over to anarchism. How much this power of restraint may be exercised, we cannot appreciate. Where one instance of it comes to our view, a thousand illustrations of it would be out of sight. On the other hand, every aggressive act on the part of the leaders must necessarily come to public notice.

We shall not find it by any means so easy a matter as might be supposed to determine who are the real labor leaders. Some of the most influential of their number rarely see their names in the press. The "labor talker" is not necessarily the "labor leader." Some of the strongest men among that class of persons may be able to say little or nothing when on their feet. They might not be able to address an audience at all. The gift of talking does not seem to be one of the most important essentials for that kind of work. The most influential labor leader I remember to have known in St. Louis was a very quiet, unobtrusive kind of a man. He had little capacity for a public speech. His name was rarely if ever in the daily papers. Under the surface he was a power. The agitator who accomplishes the most work may be the man who has very little to say. It is an unfortunate circumstance that public attention is often distracted from recognizing the actual labor leader, because people have not realized this important fact. The American spirit takes the keenest delight in talking. This tendency has permeated to the working class. I believe, in the matter

influence among the labor element, that the man who has little to say in public may often be the really influential person. The men who do the most talking are often the poorest representatives of the class to which they belong. We need to look very closely, sometimes, in order to find out who are the men of power at the center of agitation. There is a set of talkers among the working class who really are not labor leaders at all.

Probably one of the most serious and difficult questions in reference to this whole matter would be to decide or discover who are the leaders of the leaders. From what do these men take their cue? Relatively few of them have original minds, because there are relatively few original minds anywhere. We may see a change coming over a class or a special body of men. We begin to wonder at once whence it started. The waves of the labor movement in this country have tended to move from one storm center.

What I am saying on this point is peculiarly illustrated by the change now taking place in the minds of the labor leaders in America. The storm center of the labor movement during this century has been in England. This is an all-important fact. It is from there that the labor leader among us is liable to take his cue. I believe the history of the movement for a long time back would prove the truth of this assertion. We might expect it to be just the contrary. There has been a very large German element among the working class in America. Yet the attitude of mind of the labor leaders in Germany has not tended to influence the attitude of mind of the leaders in this country.

We see this conspicuously in the views taken in reference to seeking legislation from the government. The English labor movement has been from the start largely of a different kind. It has been trades unionism. They only sought repeal of legislation in order to secure freedom to organize. That is to say, it has tended to be an effort to secure their purposes through private organization. The socialistic tendencies have also been decidedly in the background in America. A few in this country were striving for them most energetically, but they had accomplished very little. I recollect a conversation with Samuel

Gompers, president of the Federation of Labor Unions, when he said to me that after all he did not think so very much of the importance of the state or of endeavoring to accomplish results through legislation or government. It was an interesting utterance, because it struck me as characteristic of much of the labor movement of this country. But now we see the other tendency manifest. Only a short time ago, the statement was made publicly as coming from Gompers, to the effect that he thought the time had come when the laboring class should enter politics as a class. This means a radical change. But when we ask the reason why, we recognize where the cue has come from. The attitude of the labor leaders in England has been going through a transformation. Trades unionism there is becoming more and more socialistic. It is looking to government action. They have already have several leaders in Parliament. They have announced as their program, the determination to accomplish their results for their class by means of legislation.

The labor leader of this country unquestionably is disposed to take his cue from England. And so he, too, now shows the same socialistic leaning. It indicates why we really need to study these leaders. We recognize the actual storm center whence the waves move to our shores. Germany is now the center of influence and probably would not be so here, even if three quarters of the working class were of German parentage. But the change is now coming in this country. How far it will extend we cannot prophesy.

The labor leader is using quite different language from that of Gompers a few years ago. A few weeks since, I saw the report that a prominent leader was to speak on Saturday evening in this city. Naturally I went to hear him. On pushing open the door the very first words that struck my ear before he entered the room was the exclamation of the speaker, "We must get control of the government." This appears now to be the watch-cry. But it did not start from the mass of the people; it came from the leaders. It did not start from the average laborer, but from the leaders of the leaders; that is, from the representatives of the labor movement in England.

Probably the most important question of all in reference to this subject is as to the ultimate *motive* of the labor leader. What is he really striving for? His destiny as an influence is all going to be determined by the answer to this one inquiry. Is it with him a question of ideals or of business? Has he at heart, as a supreme aim, the desire to improve his whole class? Is he really actuated to some extent by the care for the good of all mankind, or is it only a question of getting more wages? On this point opinions differ most radically. The majority of persons would say that what actuates him is just "business." If that is the case, if he is merely a kind of president of a labor trust in order to get a larger share of the loaf for his class, then his appearance on the arena of human affairs is only temporary. Under these circumstances he certainly will not have a permanent place in social science or political economy. He will simply be a passing phenomenon brought about by the very peculiar conditions of the nineteenth century.

Only a very close analysis of this special class of workers can determine the basis of motive or of purpose which actuates them. It would be easy enough to bring evidence which might help to prove the unqualified selfishness of such persons. It has to be remembered that human nature very rarely is actuated by undivided motives. No man is altogether selfish or altogether unselfish. It would be something well-nigh miraculous if a man were to appear out of that class with such absolute devotion to the human race as to be wholly free from any personal or private aims. We must not forget that his whole early struggle for existence will have cultivated these latter motives. If a man has been almost driven to selfishness in getting enough to eat and to provide for his family in his early years, these motives cannot suddenly die away when he becomes a little more free and has other ambitions.

The labor leader begins his life with a desperate struggle for existence. He is obliged at the start to be aggressive, and is so, and has to be so to a degree, in order to keep alive. He comes from a class where children do not receive a start through the help of family. He begins to earn his own living, perhaps,

when he is ten or twelve years of age. The motives called *then* must more or less dominate his whole life. It means or nothing, therefore, just to mention some unselfish acts on part of the labor leader. We should know that they were in advance. They would be sure to be there, owing to the way he begins his life. What we need to look for would be the indications of another spirit. It is possible that a latent enthusiasm for higher things could awaken after the first struggle for existence has been begun and the path has been cleared. The real reform spirit might also take advantage of these circumstances, and become an influential motive in a man's life, although not the exclusive motive. But the labor leader would never be a saint. The other motives which have been nourished in early years would always more or less exert their influence. The vital problem is, whether this spirit of reform does actuate these men *to some extent*. If this is the case, if they really are stirred at heart with a strong desire to improve the moral condition of the whole class to which they belong; if it is not simply a question of getting a larger share of the loaf for themselves and their fellows; if there is a genuine element of idealism in such men, then it is beyond question that as a class "they have come to stay." If the reform spirit is the real motive in their hearts, then they are likely to be a permanent factor in the coming centuries, both in the production and distribution of wealth.

There is, of course, a certain class of pure theorists who become such ardent advocates of social ideals as to lose all practical insight into what is possible or impossible. They know nothing but their one theory. It develops almost into a quackery. Yet we can respect the man for his sincerity and idealism, just as, in spite of ourselves, we stand in a kind of reverence for the original Don Quixote. But the majority of the labor leaders are practical, sometimes too practical, and without any idealism.

It may be that we cannot at the present time give a proper answer to this aspect of the problem. The labor leader has become a new factor in civilization that he cannot altogether be understood. He is not a philosopher. Neither is he a machine.

circumstances of his life and the peculiarities of his purpose would all tend to bring about an unusual complexity of motives. If we analyze him as we would ordinary human nature, we should lose ourselves in contradictions. We might prove such a person to be an impossibility. Yet he is there and gives evidence that we must change our method of analysis. We must come at him in a different way. We can observe, at least, that the process of argument which he uses in working up his cause is unquestionably more or less tinged with ethical sentiment. His cry as a watchword is not "more wages," but rather "less injustice." He certainly wants to give his movement the appearance of having idealistic aims. The charge by which he seeks to win sympathy among the class to which he belongs is that the people of wealth do not have such aims.

On close inspection we can observe that he is seeking to build up a certain consensus of sentiment around words of moral import, although at times he may use the words in a very unauthorized way. Such phrases as "wage slavery" are constantly on the lips of the labor leaders. It is novel sometimes to watch how they use words of that kind and make them tell on an audience. I remember not long ago listening to a speaker who had come from Ireland, and was thinking of settling in this country. He was addressing a large body of workingmen in St. Louis. In the course of an autobiographical sketch, he sought to describe how he had been weighing in the balance as to which political party he would join. At first he had been inclined to go with the Democrats. But, as he said, on looking back over their history he discovered that they had been the party of "black" slavery. Then, on the other hand, when he was about to become a Republican, he examined their record and discovered that they were the party of "white" slavery. For this reason he had rejected them both and become a "socialist." The expression interested me only because one could see how aptly he had chosen the phrases with which to interest his audience. His narrative had a telling effect. Arguments of the kind that would mean absolutely nothing to one class of people, weigh heavily with a class of another kind.

It struck me that there might be some value in drawing on the labor leaders on this special issue by a series of questions. It might mean something, although not a great deal. Men giving answers often show more of their actual spirit than they would themselves suppose. With this idea in mind, I drew up a list of questions and sent them to a number of labor leaders in Europe and this country; also to a few men from the other class who were either known or popular among labor leaders. Replies came to me from such persons as Tom Mann of London, Tom Morgan of Chicago, Henry George of New York; also from such persons as Father Huntington and Heber Newton. Their answers were, of course, widely diverse. It would be impossible to give them here in detail. Yet some of the responses were most striking. The first question was:

"Is the labor movement of to day, taken as a whole, inspired by an ethical principle; is it actuated with an ideal of absolute justice? Or is it stirred by business considerations of getting more wages for its work; just as the capitalist wants to get more return for his capital or more profit out of his business?"

To this the Chicago labor leader replied: "The question changed in form could be answered thus: That part of the labor movement known as trades unionism subordinates ethical principles to the principles of immediate relief, work for the best condition under the circumstances; while that known as the socialist labor movement is founded on ethical principles and measures all by the most comprehensive conception of right. Tom Mann replied: "The labor movement is fed by business considerations, but inspired by ethical principles. Hundreds of instances might be cited where action has been taken by bodies of workers on purely business lines; but very rarely are movements supported by the influence of those persons connected with the labor movement whose help is requisite for success, unless the principles of right dealing justify it."

The third question was to this effect: *"If there is an absolute right or an absolute justice, at what particular point does it enter the social problem; that is, where does the social problem cease to be a question of business, of wages and profits, and become a problem of right?"*

ethics?" Tommy Morgan, as one labor leader, replied: "When it attacks the whole system of business, wages and profits, and fights for the principles of equity as the basis of all our social relations, it becomes a problem of ethics." Tom Mann gives the concise reply: "The social problem becomes a question of ethics when one's love of right is stronger than one's love to possess."

To me these answers were profoundly significant. It was not whether such men really at heart believed or acted on such convictions. The important point was that they had *thought* about those issues at all, and that they were ready to give *any* answer. A great many persons would have supposed that these leaders had no kind of a reply to give. It might have been assumed that such men were just struggling to get a larger share of the loaf for their class. But when a person out of his own mind is capable of giving so concise a response as the last one by Tom Mann, it proved beyond a doubt that he had already been thinking about that side of the problem. These men may not have any complete system of ethics. They probably could not be classed with a particular school, either of that science or of political economy. But such answers, from a number of different men, did indicate to me that there was in their own minds an idealistic side to their efforts. The success or failure of their movement will depend on whether this idealistic side acquires a more dominating influence over their purposes.

We cannot thoroughly understand the labor leader unless we appreciate the peculiar origin of the great labor movement of modern times. It is certainly unique. The emancipation of an under class is more liable to come about through agitation from above. But in this case it was otherwise. The labor movement started from the working class itself. It was in its origin for the most part a self-help undertaking. This has been the element both of its weakness and of its strength. The leaders or agitators had been themselves mechanics or working people. The whole history of the movement in the past is tinged by this circumstance.

There is, however, one very important distinction on this

aspect of the subject. The present labor movement, as we are coming now to understand it, did *not* so much take its start from that special class. The plans and proposals for bringing about radical changes through the action of the government, appeared to have come rather from the more educated element of society. This new tendency, which is now gaining ground among the labor leaders, can scarcely be said to have had its start from them. The movement of trades unionism, which they inaugurated in the course of the last one or two centuries, was an effort to change their condition through private organization. In so far as they sought action on the part of the state, it was more an effort to secure a repeal of former legislation.

The labor leader is now beginning to take his cue, on this point, from that other class of persons, who had been proposing the amelioration of social conditions by action of the state or of government. The center of this movement, of course, has been in Germany. Whether, however, the labor leader has taken it from that country, or whether he has imbibed it from a general tendency of the world toward centralization, may be an open question. But this change is of interest to us who may be concerned about the future labor movement in America, owing to the circumstance that our labor leaders are liable to take their cue from England. We may be more anxious about their entrance as a separate class into politics in this country, because of a different set of conditions prevailing in the United States. England is relatively a small country, with the people living close together, and perhaps with a certain average minimum stage of culture in citizenship, as well as uniformity of language. But just now, with us, we have reason to be exceedingly anxious over the increase of centralizing tendencies. With the admission of so many new states in the West, and such an enormous number of foreign-born citizens, we are beginning to realize that our first need is to develop a common kind of citizenship, before we risk any increase of centralizing legislation.

The labor leader is so very liable to play into the hands of the politician ! This is more possible in our country, with present conditions, than might be the case in England. The la

movement may half shipwreck itself in a quarter of a century if it tries this experiment in America. The labor leader will be between two fires. If he loses his influence over the class he wants to help, he becomes powerless. Not long ago an instance came under my observation where a prominent labor leader in the West, who had had a very strong hold upon his class, almost, if not altogether, lost his influence by accepting a position under a state government. His action may have been perfectly honest, but the suspicion thrown upon him was so great that he does not appear to be able to stand up against it.

We cannot help wishing, for this reason, that ere long in this country the labor leader may take a stand for himself, and develop his own individuality, separate from the movements which occur in Europe. Civilization appears to be making an entirely new experiment in this country. We might, perhaps, wish that the labor leader would catch the inspiration of New World efforts, and develop a distinctive type for our own country. We have a different set of problems on this soil, and they may have to be settled in a different way.

My effort in this article has not been intended with the special desire to justify the labor leader, but rather to call attention to his *importance*. The conditions of the industrial world are changing in a way that is liable to increase rather than diminish his influence. Manufacturing establishments more and more are becoming stockholding corporations. The intimate personal relationship between employer and wage-earner is becoming less and less a factor. The stockholders may live in one city, and the business exist in another city. It has struck me that some of the worst difficulties which have arisen in the last quarter of a century between the laborer and the capitalist, have been where the business consisted of one of those large impersonal corporations. The wage-earner had no contact with his employer. The factors controlling conditions appear to have been the workingman, the labor leader, and an impersonal corporation. If this tendency develops, then the labor leader is liable to acquire greater and greater influence, because his relationship is direct and personal.

The problem both for government and for society will be What is to be done about him? Shall he be repressed or encouraged? Is he, on the whole, an evil or a good influence? He appears to have been a power not only over the feeling of his class but also directly in the domain of production and distribution of wealth. It seems now to be admitted that wages within the last half century have increased. Economists are inclined to accept the assertion that trades unionists have had quite a little to do in bringing about this increase of wages. If my argument is correct, that the labor leader is the author of this trades union movement, then he is a conspicuous factor in altering, to this extent, the distribution of wealth and giving a somewhat larger share to wages. He would therefore be an important factor in economics, as well as in political and social science.

For this reason, I am driven to think that it would be of great value if economists would lay more stress on the study of the labor leader. Would it not be possible to have a thorough and prolonged investigation of his work? Would it not be well if something could be done in writing up with great care the biographies of some of these men? If a large number of facts could be brought together in this way, we might be able to analyze and trace tendencies in regard to these men and their influence. As we have said, it is not only an issue for social science, but for economics. This kind of work ought to be done by a class of persons who would treat the subject wholly as a matter of science. They might be impressed with the importance of what they were doing. But they should not enter it with a strong bias or prejudice for or against the labor leader. If the effort were made, it might bring about results that would be surprising for their value and importance. There has been a certain lack of impartiality in the way this kind of work has for the most part been undertaken. I ask that the subject be transferred to men of science and that it be handled with depth and completeness, by men whose lives are devoted wholly to the broad study of political economy.

W. L. SHELDON

CIVICS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

VIEWS OF PROMINENT EDUCATORS ON METHODS OF TRAINING FOR CITIZENSHIP.

BY PROF. THEODORE J. WOOL.*

THE teacher's influence is great, and much can be done by him to elevate the tone of our youth, and to give proper ideas of citizenship, as well as of manhood. Let him be patriotic, and a band of young patriots will issue from under his care to take their places in their country's service, whatever that service may be. In the schoolroom, no less than in the home, the silent, imperceptible work of cleansing or purifying the character is to go on; something of a bleaching process, which subjects the unformed character to the light of truth and right. Most teachers have their own methods of instilling lessons of "the good, the true, and the beautiful," but a few practical suggestions will not be out of place, when it is understood that they are intended more specifically to direct the thought to the formation of character and the imparting of knowledge with a view to making good citizens.

As is intimated above, good character is the foundation of good citizenship, and there is, perhaps, no more fruitful source of good in this respect, than in requiring pupils to commit to memory well selected quotations. These give the teacher abundant opportunity of dropping good seed in the fertile soil, and of fastening the thought in the memory, to recur when it is needed. Lives of good men and true should be read and talked of before the class. Many a youth's ambition has been thus aroused, and he has gone forth from the schoolroom with a live fire in his

*To be followed by papers contributed by Prof. G. H. Laughlin, Missouri State Normal School; Prof. F. A. Morse, Master Sherwin School, Boston; Prof. Jay A. Barrett, Lincoln, Neb.; Prof. H. H. Swain, Yankton College, S. D.; Prof. Geo. G. Wilson, Brown University; Prof. E. W. Bemis, University of Chicago.

breast, the heat of which has permeated a community, a state or a nation. But while character is the foundation, knowledge is the superstructure, for we must have *enlightened* citizens. Not merely knowledge of geography and arithmetic, but knowledge of the principles of government and the laws of the country. All should not be lawyers; but all should be acquainted with the practical operation of the machinery of the city, state, and national governments, and the more important laws which relate to the rights of persons and the punishments for crimes. Knowledge of this character cannot well be imparted by means of a text-book, for all too soon it will grow dull, tiresome, and uninteresting, and the pupil would weary of the dry routine. But let the teachers of primary grades, each day, before school is dismissed, ask a question relating to the municipal government, and tell the little ones to come next day with the answer. Some will find it out, and those that do not will be taught, for an opportunity will be given the teacher to talk a moment or two upon the subject, and still in no way interfere with the regular school work. The teacher will propound the question thus: "Now, I want you little boys and girls to find out from anyone you can, who is the mayor of our town, and what the mayor has to do." The next day a lively time will take place for a few moments in the schoolroom, and all will be instructed. The teacher of the intermediate grades might consider the state government in the same way, and those of the higher grades, the various departments, officers, etc., of our national government. By the time a pupil has thus passed through the various grades he will have no imperfect idea of the functions of government, and will certainly approach nearer the ideal of enlightened citizenship.

In the same manner the general principles of law and more important laws relating to persons and conduct could well be taught, with pleasure and profit to teacher and pupil alike.

This method will have a reactionary effect upon the community, for fathers and brothers will find it necessary to acquaint themselves in order to satisfy the eager inquiries of the children, and will derive no little profit from the answers brought

home by them. If this method is tried by faithful teachers, the community will invariably become interested.

The great *desideratum* for this work is a series of graded questions and answers on government and laws. The questions should be carefully selected, and the answers simple and to the point. Who will undertake the work of preparing them?

The true teacher should be wide awake to the questions of the day. Too many of them know geography, but they do not know the difference between free trade and protection, while such matters as the relations of employers and working men, and the conditions which regulate the supply of goods and products, are not considered as belonging to their department; and, indeed, if they are themselves acquainted with these and kindred subjects, they do not consider the schoolroom the place to air their knowledge of them. Now the schoolroom is just the place, if the matters can be presented plainly, intelligibly, and without partisan bias.

Let our patriotic men and women investigate these subjects which are so intimately connected with the public weal, and let the knowledge be disseminated in the form of tracts, pamphlets, and in our educational journals, among the hundreds of thousands of teachers of our land, and the effect will be seen and felt even on the present generation, and certainly on the next.

Abundant opportunity will be offered the teacher that is informed on these subjects to give his pupils the benefit of his knowledge. We have no absolutely new questions before us. All are interwoven in one form or another in the history of our country, and if the teaching of history is made more a consideration of the characters and actions of men and of the great issues that have come, or are still, before the people, the pupil will be far better fitted for true citizenship than if he leaves the schoolroom with his head full of names and dates.

Surely the work of teachers is a great one, and, measured by the work, who is able to perform it? They are to be formers of character: they must have character. They are to be imparters of knowledge, and, as such, they must have not only knowledge, but the wisdom to impart it. They are to

make citizens: they must be citizens, broad-minded and patriotic. They are to make men and women: they must be men and women.

THEODORE J. WOOD

BY PROF. G. H. LAUGHLIN.

THAT "the training of a child should begin a hundred years before it is born," is a significant statement. That we inherit many of the characteristics and subjective traits of our fathers will be admitted without discussion.

The analysis of character underlies all the questions involved within the limits of instruction in the public schools. "A man's character is an assemblage of his modes of thought, tones of feeling, and methods of action."

Nature and *nurture* are the twin forces in the formation of character; inheritance and education are their concomitants. Heredity, according to Ribot, is that biological law by which all beings endowed with life tend to repeat themselves in their descendants; it is for the *species* what personal identity is for the *individual*. Out of *nature* comes *inheritance*, as out of *nurture* comes *education*; and "education is developing in due order a proportion all that is good and desirable in human nature." This volume might be written upon political ethics, another upon social ethics, and still the question of ethics in public school instruction would receive a very limited notice.

Sir William Hamilton says: "Ethics is the science of the laws which govern our actions as moral agents; and a knowledge of these laws is only a knowledge of the moral agent himself."

As psychology is the inductive philosophy of mind, so must be the necessary and universal facts by which our faculties are governed be called the nomology of mind or nomological psychology. The scope of ethical instruction, so far as it respects that compound of divinity and depravity, the schoolboy's youth, will depend very much, as it seems to me, upon the natural and acquired attainments of the child when he is placed under the direction of his instructor, and also upon the natu-

and acquired attainments of the instructor when he stands *in loco parentis*. It is not necessarily true that the public school is, *per se*, but poorly adapted to the work of imparting moral instruction.

Much depends upon the system of instruction, more upon the subject matter taught, but most of all upon the living teacher. He is the soul of inspiration and the primal source of the electric current that thrills every obedient child intrusted to his care. The true teacher will be "master of the situation." It cannot be otherwise in the very nature of the case; and yet, men and women of large experience as educators approach the educational landmarks with slow step and great care.

The term "education" is one of wonderful elasticity. It is a very plastic term. Definitions of the term are scattered along the scholastic pathway from Socrates down to our own time. A somewhat recent definition recognizes the ethical or nomological element: "Education embraces in its scope all human relations and obligations, all the possibilities of human activity."

It is *thus* the product of the combined influences of the family, the school, the church, and the state. The child must be treated as a free, self-active, rational being—a free moral agent. Considered from the ethical standpoint, "created in the image of God," he is the most exquisite and wonderful being that ever came from the hand of God. His possibilities in the direction of "the good, the true, and the beautiful," are almost infinite. Considered from the standpoint of his innate tendency to evil, his possibilities are seen to be almost as low as the lowest. The almost miraculous task of the teacher is to lift up and hold up, and continue to hold up, this latter class. In every school the extremes in the field of ethics meet. To have all in the former class would make teaching the most pleasant of all professions; to have all in the latter class would drive the teaching profession out of existence. Let it be postulated

(1) That children, to a certain extent, are capable of self-government.

(2) That their wills may be brought in subjection to the will of the teacher.

(3) That when a pupil's will is thus brought into subjection from a sense of right and pleasure, the pupil is obedient.

(4) That obedience is the school of command.

(5) That obedience is the ultimate product of discipline, that discipline perfected is liberty or moral emancipation.

A teacher can do but little for a genius or a dunce. The most visible results of his work are in the golden mean between these extremes. The most important work in ethics is the education of the *will*.

All acts of the will are put forth in view of motives of a certain kind. Although the motive may be the *occasion*, it is the *cause* proper of the act. Whether the will is free or not depends upon the relative position that writers on ethics assume to it. The acts of the will are unquestionably *intentions*, *choices*, and *volitions*. A person may intend to secure a certain result. All acts by and through which that intention is sought to be carried out are called volitions. In the *intention* and *choice* the will is absolutely free. We are conscious of our freedom, but the *volitions* are subordinate executive acts, and are not necessarily free. The seeming interdependence between intention and volition has probably led to the view that both should be regarded as subordinate to the will. As intentions control other acts of the will, the moral character of the latter is determined by that of the former. The educated will is the balance-wheel of character. "In acts of moral wrong, the will follows the strongest *feeling*, in opposition to the dictates of *intelligence*. In doing right, it not unfrequently holds in subjection the strongest feeling, while it yields obedience to the behests of conscience."

The will is most prominent in the work of character building, although the elements used in the formation of character are the subjects of birth. Character grows with the unfolding of the soul powers and develops with their evolution.

In the teaching of history there is a large field in which the cultured teacher may give instruction in civil polity, ethics, and economics. Such lessons may be coördinated with the least thought, yet do no violence to the text.

The marvelous growth in international law, made in the

fifty years by the most progressive nations, could be examined with profit to classes in our high schools and state normal schools.

The "school readers" furnish themes for incidental instruction in philosophy, ethics, oratory, poetry, law, and patriotism. Instruction along these several lines, given in connection with the leading themes in the text-books, will be found to be a good preparation for *citizenship*. Should it be the good fortune of the student, having received this preparatory instruction, to continue his studies in a school of high grade, he would become in all respects what might be termed "a typical American citizen."

Liberty and necessity are the constituent elements of freedom in its highest ethical sense. If the truth make one free, he is free indeed.

Dr. W. T. Harris asks the question, "Do the public schools educate children beyond the position which they must occupy in life?" The question may be answered both affirmatively and negatively. In the great cities of our country, the possible intellectual culture is beyond the possible position of the average public school pupil. In the small towns, villages, and rural districts, it is below the possible position of the average pupil. He also asks, "Why educate the child out of his sphere? Why teach him to aspire beyond the position which the vast majority must always occupy?"

Considered from the view of intellectual culture, children are sometimes carried beyond the limits of their destined sphere of activity. An educated rascal is more dangerous than an uneducated one. In ethical instruction, children are seldom advanced as far as the limits of active life demand. It seems to be the mature judgment of many of our best educators that the limits of moral instruction in our public schools should be considerably extended. The bent of mind and the inspiration of soul given by the child's first teacher—the mother—will largely shape all subsequent teachings. If this instruction on the part of the mother be along the ascending scale in ethics, the one who continues the task of teaching the child will behold good results in the near future. If the mother's instruction be

along the descending scale in ethics, the one who stands *parentis* will probably wish that he stood in some other place.

Whether the teacher shall succeed in directing the well-moral training and in carrying it to its intended consummation will depend more on the moral status of the teacher than on his intellectual status of the pupil.

As to results in morals, we too often console ourselves by hoping for grand things in the golden age, which is always in the near future.

President Adams, of Cornell University, is disposed to put the test made in the living present. He says, "Greater stress should be laid upon teaching of ethical obligations. I hold that the general abandonment in our schools of direct religious teaching, however necessary a consequence of our government's divorce of church and state, brings with it the absolute necessity of a more general teaching of the laws of moral obligation. These need not and should not be taught in any sectarian manner. But it is a fact, as alarming as it is obvious, that there is a growing cloudiness of public opinion as to the real difference between 'ought' and 'ought not.' This evil, and I think one of stupendous magnitude, can be corrected only in the family and in the schools."

Strictly moral duties are twofold—duties to ourselves and to our neighbors. In a higher and theological sense, duties are threefold, expressing the degrees in the order of a climb from self, to neighbor, and to God—*selfhood*, *neighborhood*, *Godhood*. The world's matchless Teacher combines these views in a great lesson, condensing the Decalogue into two commandments, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."—Matt. 22 : 37-40.

G. H. LAURENCE

BY PROF. F. A. MORSE.

WHETHER he will or not, the character of the school

is the most powerful force we have in the education of our youth in the subject of ethics. This force may be silent, and unconsciously exercised, but is none the less potent. In the advancement of this branch of education, give the first thought, then, to the teacher. Through our educators and the public, elevate his occupation to that of a profession. Enhance it with a certain tenure and a sufficient money value to attract the best of talent as well as the choicest of character.

Ethics, up to the present time, has been taught in the schoolroom most successfully when the instruction was unexpected, and presented to the pupil while circumstances and events, as well as the general feeling, were conducive to good results. No child relishes a regular diagnosis of himself morally. How he is to think and act, how to repress the evil and encourage the good that is in him, becomes stale and repugnant when served in systematic and regular doses. The skilful teacher will always find sufficient opportunity in connection with the regular work of the schoolroom to build character among his pupils, and these auspicious moments should never be lost sight of. A pupil's temper has dominated him ; a theft has been committed ; improper language used ; a quarrel started. These facts can and should be made impressive means of instruction in morals. Then in the different branches of study, especially history, rare subjects for thought and talks are always found. Take our Washington, Lincoln, Grant, Franklin, Longfellow, Whittier, etc., and what can be made more inviting, and at the same time instructive, in the line of character building, than a familiar consideration of the events and fruits of these eminent lives ? The children become interested, and quickly formulate causes and the following results, consider them, see how right beginning leads naturally to right living and useful lives, and are consequently influenced to live better, more wisely, and for some definite purpose.

The principal of a school, especially if it be a large one, is a recognized factor in all these matters. He can bring his school or a portion of it together each week. This is his great opportunity. Talks on various subjects connected with the welfare of

the pupils can be given, and morals successfully taught. is wise and discreet, his influence can be made to be far ing and effective. While the principal, during the g management of his school, must be a constant educa morals and manners, his supreme moment is when he sta the presence of his teachers and pupils, and commands mind. While I would gladly welcome a text-book on the ject of ethics, one born of experience, not of theory, I believe it would serve its purpose as well in the hands pupil for regular lessons as for a guide and help to the t in his occasional talks.

Boys are always interested in politics. It is inherent. fathers and grandfathers had a hand in managing affairs them. While girls are naturally less interested, the near will bring its woman suffrage and accompanying responsib. It is wise, then, and of prime importance, that this bra civics should be emphasized through the teaching of civi ernment in the upper grades of the grammar and high sc Advantage should be taken of all the elections, town, city, and national. Either on the day of the election or th previous, the pupils should be given a practical illustrat the preliminary steps in the campaign, and the method o ing the final ballot. While it may not be wise to allow sentation of party politics in the schoolroom, discussion o safely encouraged outside, and the pupils advised to take for the purpose of discovering that which will be of the g public value. Class debate can be made interesting and in ive when it is upon popular subjects—important qu agitating the country—like protection and free trade, cu trusts, labor troubles, etc. This encourages investigatio adds not only to the pupil's intelligence, but to his voca as well.

Perhaps there is no division of civics which should be carefully and intelligently taught in our public schools th which pertains to civil polity—obedience to rightful aut Even the kindergartener at four years of age can be and to understand and obey the authority of his teacher, and

readily how one child should be considered as well as another, and that all have equal rights and privileges. If we wish to educate our youth to become good and loyal citizens of our country, they must be taught somewhere, either at home or at school, and better at both, the necessity for proper authority and the obedience and respect due to it.

There is a mistaken idea entertained by a goodly percentage of our general public, that the rights of the individual child should be considered beyond the point where it would be for the good of the whole number; that love and tenderness, natural characteristics of all true discipline, should be shown to that extent that the obedience expected is forfeited and respect for authority sacrificed; also, that when the obstinacy and self-will of the child prevents his yielding submission to just school laws, he should be expelled from school.

While the rod is to be abandoned as far and as fast as the good discipline, skilfully applied, will allow, yet it would be a misfortune to any community to do away with it with no good equivalent, and sacrifice a healthy respect for authority to a sentimentality shown by so many, even among our educators, whose experience in discipline has been in the theory rather than the practice of it. "Train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it," is sound doctrine, applicable now as well as years ago. The good take care of themselves. It is for their protection and the control of the bad that we legislate. The half dozen bad boys of any class are the backbone of all mischief and trouble. The good have rights which should be respected, and the law should be swift and sure in its dealings with the obstinately defiant.

Place wise, discreet teachers in the schools, and support them heartily in a vigorous discipline of the disobedient. Children taught to respect and obey authority in school will, as a rule, respect and obey public laws after they leave the school, and will understand better how to acquit themselves as good citizens.

The subject of civics has been considered thus far from the standpoint of the secondary or grammar schools, and therefore in a rudimental manner. I cannot see wherein very much of

its coördinate division—economics—can be presented to grade of schools with advantage. It is a subject belonging to college course and requiring more maturity of judgment to understand than is generally found in a youth of fourteen or fifteen years of age. Still, something can be done indirectly in connection with the studies of geography, civil government and history, and in the high schools quite a little can be accomplished.

I again suggest the debating class as the best means for arousing interest and obtaining the widest range of thought and opinion.

This whole subject is one of deep interest to all ardent supporters of our republican form of government. Too much cannot be spoken or written about it. To train our youth into intelligent and patriotic citizens may well be an essential well defined part of the curriculum of the public schools.

In connection, we must not forget the nation's colors. They have a prominent and distinctive part to perform in this education. Our flag should adorn every schoolroom as well as the building. The pupils should be taught to love and honor it and to systematically and reverently salute it and pledge allegiance to the country for which it stands.

FRANCIS A. M.

BY PROF. JAY A. BARRETT.

IT IS with no thought of unearthing a new idea that I begin this article by saying that the set-lesson method of teaching has been abandoned long since by progressive educators. Throughout the school systems it is now giving way to rational methods of instruction. Teachers are trying to find more satisfactory ways to arrive at the ends of education. The methods more direct and yielding greater results than the commit-and-recite plan. In every important branch of the inquiry is, "How can this work best be taken up?" It is my purpose to attempt to answer this question in its application to the study of constitutions.

It is customary with the authors of text-books upon civil government to reproduce at great length the provisions of a constitution in the lessons which relate to organization prescribed in constitutions. It is thought sufficient to print the document itself, as a mere appendix, reference to which is rendered quite unnecessary by the faithful but too often unsatisfactory repetition of the contents, if it is in the main part of the book. I am led to ask, however, whether there is not in this arrangement a great waste of time and energy. Just why the constitution of a state government or the United States Constitution may not itself be made the basis of study, does not appear. Often, perhaps, there is an effort to improve upon the language of the instrument, or an arrangement of the material for the better assignment of lessons is attempted. Perhaps, too, the author does not see how the necessary explanations can be made without rewriting the constitution. Both text-book and teacher usually urge upon the learner a careful reading of the appended document, in addition to the required lesson covering the same ground. I have ever found that but few of a class will faithfully read the constitution, when it involves going over the same ground twice. It is, indeed, but natural that the student should not wish to waste time thus.

The question, therefore, as it presents itself to my mind, is this: "How can a constitution itself be made the basis of study?" In answer, I submit a plan which I have embodied in a little volume for the Nebraska schools.* The essence of the whole plan is to have, first, a plain text of the constitution in large, clear type; accompanying this, a list of the topics of study involved in the constitution, in the order in which they arise, with references to the articles and sections. Along with these topics, in foot notes, is the collateral matter deemed sufficient for a clear understanding of technical terms and historical references involved. I cannot better explain myself than to give a short example† from the volume referred to:

* "The History and Government of Nebraska." Lincoln, Neb.: J. H. Miller, 1892.

† pp. 98-99.

A.—PERSONAL RIGHTS GUARANTEED BY THE CONSTITUTION.* Art. I.

1. Inherent Rights, Art. I., §§ 1, 26.
2. Object of Government, § 1.
3. Slavery, § 2.
4. Freedom of Conscience, § 4.
5. Freedom of Speech and of the Press, § 5.
6. Trials by Jury, §§ 6, 10-13.
7. Search and Seizure, § 7.
8. *Habeas Corpus*,† § 8.
9. Bail, Fines, and Punishments, § 9.
10. Treason, § 14.
11. Penalties: *Corruption of Blood; Forfeiture; Transportation*,
§ 15.
12. Relation of Civil and Military Power, §§ 17, 18.

What, now, are the advantages of this arrangement of a constitution for the use of a class? It is simply the topical method applied to this work. All the arguments in favor of that method may be urged. These do not need to be told to the intelligent teacher of to-day. So clearly does the plan place the emphasis upon ideas instead of upon words, so manifestly does it best utilize the time and energy of the learner, that its utility is not far to seek. The introduction of the historical method brings about a need for a copy of the state statutes, or enlivens and intensifies the interest in such a reference book already on hand. It was long ago said by Commissioner Harris, that it is not what the teacher does for a student, but what the teacher makes the student do for himself, that counts. The saying is not less true of the study of the place and duty of a citizen than of any other branch; rather truer. I believe that the topical method placed before a class in this form will best bring out individual work and thought. The greatest possible inter-

* The idea of putting a bill of rights into a constitution has descended to new states from the original thirteen. It is largely a statement of the rights denied to the colonists by Great Britain.

† A writ is in the form of a letter stamped with an official seal. It is addressed by court to a person, commanding something to be done or not to be done. *Habeas corpus* means "you may have the body." The writ of this name is directed to the officer in whose charge a person is, bringing the prisoner before a certain court in order to test the legality of his imprisonment.

‡ These three are old English penalties. Formerly, in case of high crimes, not only was the offender punished, but his descendants also. The taint that once attached an offender for the commission of a felony in England deprived him and his descendants of the right to inherit and transmit property. This taint is called *corruption of blood*. A *forfeiture* was the penalty by which the state deprived one of property. *Transportation* suggests the Russian exile system, by which political prisoners are banished far into the interior of Siberia. Such a penalty is entirely foreign to the spirit of American institutions.

est, the most direct contact with materials, the utmost activity of each pupil's mind, should obtain where his relation to the state is concerned. For the most part the teacher will not find the topics already prepared for him. This is not altogether a disadvantage. The work of preparing the topics is no more than a fair preparation of the teacher for the place of instructor. Some of this work may be done by the pupils. In any case, the work presupposes a live teacher, not afraid of expending much time and energy on every lesson. To such teachers these suggestions are made.

JAY A. BARRETT.

BY PROF. H. H. SWAIN.

SINCE teaching consists so largely in simplifying truth, it seems the plainest truism to say that instruction should begin with what is simple, close at hand, and easy to understand, and only after this has been thoroughly mastered, advance to what is far away, complex, and difficult of comprehension. No one would deny such a general statement. In many lines of instruction the principle is faithfully put into practice. But in others quite the reverse is true. Geography, if taught by the use of text-books from the leading American publishing houses, starts with the consideration of the earth as a part of the solar system, proceeds with the general features of the globe, treats the grand divisions in varying degrees of detail, and finally comes down in the appendix, usually omitted, to what begins to approach, not with undue familiarity, the near at hand. So in teaching civil government, there is too often a tendency to begin, and end too, with what is most distant and most complex. There are places where a teacher can obtain a first grade certificate, whose study of civil government has been confined to a manual on the Constitution of the United States, who never saw a copy of the state constitution, and to whom a city charter would be as great a curiosity as a medieval parchment.

This method is not only objectionable from a theoretical, educational point of view. There are other practical reasons why the study of civil government should begin with local

institutions, and, in elementary courses, give the largest share of attention to these and the state governments. In the first place, the means for study in a truly scientific way will then be much more abundant. Study of the national government must be largely by text-book. Classes cannot visit meetings of Congress, they cannot converse with the president on the policies of his administration, in general they cannot attend sessions of the federal courts. Study of the national government is very apt, therefore, to be no living study of government at all—only an analysis of the Constitution—anatomy, the handling of of an artificial skeleton. But it is quite practicable for classes to attend town meetings or meetings of the county board or city council or even primary caucuses. They can inspect the original records in the public offices. In short, they can examine the whole organism in living operation.

In the second place, study of local institutions brings to pupils the knowledge which it is of the greatest consequence for them to have. The questions of transcendent importance in government are not the tariff and the currency. The difference in the effect of absolute free trade and the most extreme form of a protective tariff would be less to the average citizen than the difference between extravagance, corruption, or incompetency in local government, and a thoroughly honest and intelligent management of city or county affairs.

Again, in giving the first and greatest attention to local government, information and interest will be increased where it is most needed. But little more than a century ago there was complaint that the national government could not command the services of the men foremost in ability, because they were kept at home to work in their state governments. Now, just the contrary is the case. No state government is administered with such efficiency as the government of the nation. Every state legislature is inferior to the Congress, and the usual character of city councils has become proverbial.

Here, also, the coming citizen will find his greatest opportunity for exerting wholesome influence. In the nation the individual is an almost indistinguishable drop. In the local com-

munity he may be a powerful factor. Especially if his understanding of local government is clear and thorough, he will be likely to find abundant chance to exercise his powers. This participation, also, will be the best training possible for the few whose work will reach far into the broader field. It was just because our forefathers were so thoroughly trained in the town and county meetings and the state legislatures that they were able to establish a nation of enduring strength.

Because such study can be pursued by direct investigation it will interest the pupils. But the interest will not stop with them. They must be constantly storming parents with questions and with appeals for help in their researches. Caucuses will not be forgotten so often. Public officials will be surprised with frequent visits from their constituents, to the great improvement of both the officials and the visitors.

The most important thing, then, in the study of civil government is to begin at the foundation, to study it, so far as possible, at first hand, and thus to gain an acquaintance with living realities—an acquaintance which will be constantly expanding, and which will lead directly to valuable practical results.

H. H. SWAIN.

BY PROF. GEO. G. WILSON.

IT MUST be taken for granted that every teacher is anxious to make the best citizens possible of his pupils. For this purpose the state appropriates money for his salary. There must be some knowledge on the part of the pupil as to his civic duties and privileges before he is well prepared to become a citizen. It is sometimes difficult to impart such knowledge, and often more difficult to arouse the interest of the pupil in the subject of citizenship. The following method was tried with success under conditions somewhat above the average :

1. The different officers of the city were asked to present to the school a brief sketch of the office, its duties, and significance ; *e. g.*, the city clerk or one of his subordinates, the tax assessor, the mayor, a councilman, etc.

2. The representatives of the national government were asked

to do the same; *e. g.*, the postmaster, revenue officer, United States representatives, etc.

3. Citizens who had served the state or local government were asked to present special features of interest; *e. g.*, the commander of the Grand Army, Daughters of the Revolution, retired army or naval officer, ex-consul, editor, judge, etc.

The order above given seems advisable, as it arouses interest in affairs near the pupil first, and then in those more remote both in time and place.

Usually no great difficulty will be found in obtaining such talks—for they would better be talks than essays, lectures, or orations. A *definite time limit* should always be observed. "Not more than twenty minutes" is usually a good limit. The limit should be distinctly understood by the speaker, as the tendency will be to run over time, and this is very disastrous to the interest of the pupil.

The interest of the pupil is usually greater in the live official than in a printed description of him. There is, also, another side to this sort of work. The official, of course, must present the ideal side of his duty, or what he should do rather than what he does do, perhaps. This may be a revelation to him, as well as to the pupils. The fact that he has made this public statement of his duty will make him realize more fully what is necessary to the full performance of all the office implies.

GEO. G. WILSON

BY PROF. EDWARD W. BEMIS.

ETHICAL training can be most satisfactorily given in our public schools without the use of any religious sanctions such as "God commands it," "Christ so said," "The Bible orders it." The one need is the right kind of teacher, such as nearly every one has some time in his life met, and who has been a grand inspiration without ever referring to positive religious sanction in the schoolroom, though I believe in such sanctions.

Again, teaching of our institutions and the duty of honest citizenship, and of not shirking political duties, or voting for ward bummers and spoilsmen, must be inculcated, as also manual

training. To secure these there are needed far better school boards—to get better superintendents and so better teachers. Many more teachers, and better paid, as well as more carefully selected, are necessities, if we would in time rise out of the degrading condition of government in our city and state legislatures.

Within three days, two prominent politicians, with hands fresh from bribery, as they privately admitted, declared to the writer that with a fair amount of money they could carry their respective cities for any measure.

Fifty-two out of sixty-eight aldermen of one of our largest cities were in the market for sale two years ago, asserts one of the best informed legislators of the city in question.

Some of our worst anarchists are the seekers after valuable public franchises by corrupt means, and there are those among our rich who strive to escape their share of taxation. But apathetic because ignorant voters make it possible.

Instruction in the ethic and economic relations of man to man and to society, must be given in our public schools, and compulsory education with proper truant schools, and inspectors holding office on a civil service reform basis, must keep our future citizens and masters in school long enough to save them and our endangered institutions.

Much can be done by university extension work—lectures to the masses and to the well-to-do, in courses of six to twelve lectures by the same lecturer on some great department of civics. Endowments are needed for such courses from our strong young college professors, who, under such men as Professors Ely, Seligman, Clark, and many others, have secured a training abreast of the times.

E. W. BEMIS.

PULLMAN AND ITS LESSONS.

BY THOMAS BURKE GRANT.

THE loss which this country has sustained during the Pullman strike, in the volume of business transacted at home and the depreciation of credit abroad, assuredly justifies a thorough examination of the causes which created it, and which the prompt action of the executive alone prevented from reaching the magnitude of a national crisis.

The spasmodic conflicts between labor and capital have hitherto been minor events, and have invariably adjusted themselves without threatening to disturb the well grounded security of American institutions. But in the late extensive and menacing strike there was manifested such a stubborn determination on the part of workingmen to resist cold steel, that even the most optimistic may pause in the indulgence of a usually serene satisfaction to inquire whether we have not escaped a real danger, and whether, after all, the treatment of workingmen by those who control capital is as it should be.

To many people, who looked on from a distance at the scene enacted in Chicago, it was simply incomprehensible how, after a winter of acute suffering, and in the midst of still dull times, so large a body of men as responded to the American Railway Union, and dwelling over a range of country extending from the Ohio to the Pacific, should, for any but the gravest injustice, throw down their tools and stop all the arteries of transcontinental commerce. Was it that the people were malicious and acting as alleged, from purposes of wanton mischief, or from a desire to dictate terms to their masters? Were they disloyal, or did they intend to precipitate a crisis and endanger the institutions of the country? By no means. The masses of workingmen are law-abiding, honest people, quite as loyal and as patriotic as

the average of their employers. This the employers themselves, if they were to speak their honest minds, would be among the first to admit. The causes of the strike must not, therefore, be attributed to any perversity of character on the part of workingmen, and must be searched for in other directions, and mainly in the aggressive disposition of capital to triumph over employees as effectually as it now controls legislation in Congress, or justice on the bench, or national feeling through the channels that mold public opinion. Being so accustomed to have his way in all these matters, the capitalist, in the flush of victorious achievement, thinks it strange that he cannot also dictate terms to the illiterate and unorganized rabble who perform manual labor, and who are dependent upon him for their daily bread. This one circumstance the capitalist cannot understand. It is the one dark and threatening cloud hovering over a horizon of a life of sunshine and of happy existence. Of this false notion the capitalist needs to be cured, if the country is to be saved, for if the recent rumpus at Chicago means anything, it is that in the conflict between labor and capital will some day be discovered the Achilles' heel of this republic. When strikes make their appearance in this country, as they do periodically, people are very apt to read of the obstinacy and the lawlessness of the laboring classes, and while much blame is undoubtedly fairly attributable to them, there are two sides to this, as to all other questions. It ought not to be lost sight of that it is not to the interest of any class, and least of all to the working class, to disturb the even flow of trade and commerce. To the workingman the strike is at all times a hazardous contingency, for the success of which he is heavily handicapped by the greater skill of the employer, and by his superior command of those resources which enable him to come out of the struggle with success. A man, with a tender wife and little ones dependent on his daily wages, must, upon the other hand, always enter upon a strike, even under the most favorable circumstances, with a doubtful heart and frequently with a feeling of blank despair. When work ceases with him, his credit ends and his savings are rapidly eaten up. Not so with the employer,

who sometimes, as in Mr. Pullman's case, has millions stored away, and which, in the most prolonged struggle or in any conceivable form of extravagance, he could scarcely exhaust. The capitalist may lose a few hundred dollars, but what of that? He does not personally participate in the strike in behalf of his own interests, or those of his class, as must the workingman. The employer usually learns of the progress of matters during a state of hostilities, from a safe distance, and through his foreman in much the same way a commander-in-chief of an army in the field, reads the dispatches from the seat of war. His life, or that of his family, is never risked. His property is also insured, and such of it as may not be covered by insurance he is pretty certain to recover payment for, through the same influence on legislation by which he already manipulates the laws or dodges the public taxes with impunity. In plain words, the employer, in the case of a strike, holds a trump card against the workingman every time, and therefore common sense, as well as the logic of the case, suggests that in nine cases out of ten a strike is caused by the abuse of prerogatives on the part of the owner, and by an encroachment on the rights of labor which the sturdy independence of American workingmen can no longer tolerate.

This line of reflection is aptly suggested and will, I think, be borne out by a calm review of the underlying facts centered around the management of Pullman City. Without attempting to decide who is in the wrong, I think it will be shown that the exercise of a little Christian feeling on the part of Mr. Pullman would have averted the scenes that shocked the people at Chicago, and brought the nation itself up to the very gates of hostility between the federal and the state powers, and, therefore in the presence of the tumult that existed, within measurable distance of civil war. Let us see how this condition of things originated. Early in the spring of this year, Mr. Pullman began to carry out a resolution, according to a well-informed correspondent of the *New York Herald*, that in the event of Mr. Cleveland's election, "Pullman would have to shut down or run on half pay." Mr. Pullman began to verify his prediction b

manifesting such a spirit to the carpenters and iron workers in his employ as to compel them on May 5 to organize a branch of the American Railway Union. At this meeting complaints were made that rents and living expenses were absorbing all the wages of the men; that those who had homes and who had invested their savings in the place were running into debt; that men were laid off by the capricious exercise of authority on the part of Mr. Pullman's subordinates; that work was becoming irregular, in fact on "half time"; and that while the Pullman Company was receiving the same rate of remuneration for the work turned out, the men who performed the work were receiving less rates; and that the Pullman Company, while thus contracting the wages of the men and their opportunities for work, had retained the stiff rents formerly paid, and which, like a millstone around their necks, were dragging the men down to a state of poverty or of pauperism. Finally, it was declared at this meeting that things in Pullman had come to such a pass as to force the men to be really working and living for the benefit of Mr. Pullman and not for themselves or their own families.

Now this was a grave condition of affairs. It was one calculated to arouse the sympathy of any humane man. A just man would immediately have inquired into the facts; in fact, any but a cold-hearted and avaricious man, accustomed to methods of medieval tyranny, would have at once righted in some way a wrong so suggestive and so cruel upon the very face of the case. On May 9, a delegation waited on Mr. Pullman to present their grievances, and to formulate a demand (*a*) for higher wages, (*b*) for its equivalent—reduced rents, and (*c*) for more regular and steady employment. What attitude did Mr. Pullman assume toward these very reasonable and business-like demands? He refused them point plank and with a tone of a man who felt a secret satisfaction that his former prediction had come true. In effect he told the men, "You have elected Cleveland; he has ruined the country, and you can now fry in your own juice or beg or starve." Of course Mr. Pullman did not put his ideas into these words. He was sufficiently in-

discreet and impulsive to make a speech at Pullman during the late presidential campaign, substantially threatening the men that if they did not sustain protection and vote against the Democratic ticket, he would not be responsible for their folly. His language was so indiscreet on that occasion, that Pullman, which at normal times gave two thousand five hundred Republican majority, gave two thousand majority for Mr. Cleveland. "You may imagine my surprise when the returns came in," said Mr. Pullman to the *New York Herald* correspondent, and whose letter is printed under a display head, indicating that the man who wrote it was responsible for his words and knew the inside facts when he further publicly asserted that, in talking over the event, Mr. Pullman leaned forward and exclaimed slowly and vindictively, when referring to their desertion of Republican principles in the election: "I made up my mind that was the last of my sympathy for workingmen. I made up my mind that my employees in Pullman were not worth caring for, and that they would go ahead and cut wages to the bottom notch. If the working people of Pullman wanted to vote against their own interests and against my interests, I made up my mind that they could take the consequences. Now let us see how they like it." The *New York Herald*, commenting on these points and somewhat vindictive remarks, which throw a curious search light upon Mr. Pullman's treatment of his workingmen, furnishes its correspondent's letter with the following series of captions: "PULLMAN VENGEFUL—GREAT STRIKE SAID TO HAVE BEEN PROVOKED BY THE CAR BUILDER'S RETALIATORY POLICY—POLITICS BENEATH IT ALL."

Probably these facts may account for Mr. Pullman's plausible refusal to entertain the demands of his men. But, as already remarked, this refusal was not couched in the same blunt terms as his former candid threat to "cut wages to the bottom notch." Mr. Pullman was wiser this time. The responses he made to the workingmen's appeal were not that they had defeated his political aspirations, or surprised him by voting against his interests, or that they lost his \$50,000 political investment in the campaign of 1892, or that he was going to squeeze them by "cutt

wages to the last notch" in order to see "how they like it." Mr. Pullman was now all honey and dew in talking to the deputation. The cruel, callous man, who had apparently resolved to use his power to crush out all opposition or "to bull or bear" the labor field in favor of the political party for which he was an active and devout partisan, was now the generous philanthropist and the self-sacrificing, benevolent despot. He actually told the men, as an excuse for the freezing-out tactics, in his interview with them on the 9th of May, that the Pullman Company was losing \$20,000 a month by employing them at all, that the cars they were working on were being built at a loss of \$79 each, and that he was only keeping the works running just to oblige the employees. He refused the concessions the men demanded and, as the first act of retaliation for having dared to approach him on the subject, he laid off three men whose intelligence entitled them to act as spokesmen for the others, and two days later (May 11) two thousand of the men employed quit work. They had been pledged not to permit the three men who acted, to be immolated on the altar of Mr. Pullman's vengeance, and it was solemnly pledged, moreover, on the part of Mr. Pullman, that the committee approaching him would not be punished or disturbed in any way. The compact was no sooner made than it was broken by the Pullman authorities, who promptly laid off the three men.

This breach of faith, coupled with the causes already mentioned, was the direct and immediate irritant which produced the strike of the two thousand men. The American Railway Union was now called upon by the men thus forced out, and, on May 16, all the members of the American Railway Union were assessed at the rate of three cents each per day in order to assist those who had quit work at Pullman. After the lapse of four days, the men, on May 20, offered to arbitrate the matters in dispute—rent, etc. But Mr. Pullman's response was still in the line of his old policy; it was, "there was nothing to arbitrate." Several days now elapsed during which there was no attempt at violence or intimidation in any form. But matters were not mending any. The Pullman Company was determined to starve

out its men, and to reduce them through sheer physical suffering to its terms, when, on June 15, President Debs called a national convention of the American Railway Union. At this convention a special committee was appointed to confer with Mr. Pullman. The next day, June 16, the general manager of the Pullman Company told the committee of the Railway Union, which now took up the management of the case, what Mr. Pullman had formerly told the men themselves, that there was nothing to arbitrate. Matters again dragged along until June 22, when the American Railway Union, being loath in the depressed condition of the country to order a general strike, again pleaded with the Pullman authorities for a settlement, and were again refused. The terms of the reply were still that there was "nothing to arbitrate." This phrase appeared to have been agreed upon by the Pullman authorities as about the only safe reply they could give the men or the public. It was, however, another way of telling the men that they had no status in the case; that they had no rights large corporations never respect; that there was only one side to the controversy, and that the Pullman Company alone was the arbiter. One man tempted to remark here that the stock-in-trade phrase "there is nothing to arbitrate," which was used on all occasions by Pullman officials before the trouble assumed national importance, and by Mr. Pullman himself afterward, should hereafter be inscribed on the Pullman crest, particularly as the name of Pullman is likely to become as famous in American history as Runnymede has become in English history. "There is nothing to arbitrate" may yet become the Magna Charta of American industry. What were the men to do under these circumstances but to strike or to starve? Trod upon, even a worm will turn.

All this time Mr. Pullman was dealing with his employees through his deputy. He was himself complacently watching the situation develop from his palace windows on Prairie Avenue. To every appeal for settlement he turned a deaf ear, and from his retreat the sleeping-car magnate watched without emotion the sufferings of his workmen and the ruin which his selfishness or his partisanship, or his pride, had precipitated. He

doubtless soliloquizing, in the language which is attributed to him in the *New York Herald*—"Now let us see how they like it." It was only when the strike extended from Pullman City to Chicago; when the general managers resolved to defend railway traffic; when the lurid flames of burning freight cars brightened up the skies; and when the passions of the mob were inflamed—it was only then that Mr. Pullman condescended to move. But what did Mr. Pullman really do, even then? He called for the police to preserve his pictures and his plate. He rang for the obeisant darkey, who, even in this trying and rebellious period, approached his master with a low salaam, to order out his sumptuous palace car—the same that carried the Grand Duke Alexis of Russia on his hunting tour in the West, and, gorgeously attired, the Prince of Pullman, like Louis XVI., fled from the populace whose passions and whose power he defied. As fast as turning wheels could revolve, he sped away, leaving riot, carnage, death, and desolation behind. To use the words of an editorial in the *New York World*, "he fled from the scenes and sequestered himself, first at Long Branch, and then in his castle on the remote northern border." Whatever might happen the nation, Mr. Pullman was at length safe. He was actually on Canadian soil, and could claim protection of that famous flag that the poets tell us braved for a thousand years the battles of history and the breezes of a greater than Chicago's mob. Mr. Pullman, far from the mainland and the maddening crowd, could here converse with the gallant captain who, delighting in the spirit of war, fled on the twenty-sixth of June and bade the rest keep fighting.

Such are, in brief, the facts that led to the recent disastrous strike. Such were the methods and such the probable motives by which the Pullman Company generated disorder, refused all overtures for a settlement, and arrogantly defied the men. And, finally, such was the personal heroism of the head of that firm, when confronted by the trouble which he seems to have courted, and which heroism on Mr. Pullman's part may aptly remind Americans of how the country would be deserted by its millionaires in case of any serious conflict between the forces of labor

and capital. The only other case of characteristic bravery and benevolence that at all rivals Mr. Pullman's, was that exhibited by a New York millionaire who, when recently attacked by an anarchist in his office, pulled his clerk between himself and the exploding bomb, and then refused to pay compensation to his employee for blowing his body asunder, but actually had the effrontery and the meanness to resist the boy's action for damages in two courts of law.

Now let us turn from the strike and view Pullman City and Mr. Pullman from another standpoint. Let us turn to this model city and, in order that we may get a comprehensive view, let us compare the experiment in community founding which Mr. Pullman set up, the only one of its kind on this continent, with the establishments of Herr Krupp at Essen, Germany, of M. Colin at Guise, France, with that of Sir Titus Salt, at Saltaire, or the celebrated Quaker community of the Messrs. Macolmson at Portlaw, Ireland. At each of these places, towns managed on the same principle as Pullman City have been erected, and in all of these places, with greater public advantage than in the case of Mr. Pullman, who has managed his men and has exercised his power of lord of the manor to a degree more absolute than is now enjoyed by any European monarch. Pullman City was born of a crude attempt to transplant to the shores of Lake Michigan and to resurrect in the nineteenth century the ideas of those medieval barons who took pride in fostering villages in Europe beneath their castle towers, and from the turrets of which they looked down in lordly condescension on their humble retainers. The *Chicago Herald* speaks truly when it says Mr. Pullman "set up in the town of Pullman a modern satrapy—a survival of feudalism repugnant to the spirit of the nineteenth century. He has endeavored to combine a great industrial establishment with the hodge-podge of Bellamy socialism and Russian autocracy. He has attempted to revive in America an institution that has not been seen in Europe since the fifteenth or sixteenth century." Indeed, in Europe to-day, the lord of the manor, though retaining the title in certain legal documents such as leases, is lord only in name, but in free

America and in the person of Mr. Pullman, he is still a terrible reality. To do the baron justice, he still mingles with the people at certain seasons of the year, particularly when marriage is celebrated in their families or in his, at the coming of age of an heir to the estate, and at Christmas and at Whitsuntide. Upon all occasions of importance also, when any man has a grievance, the European lord of the manor, with the claims of centuries of exalted birth and of ingrained fine breeding to fall back upon, can be approached by his people with far less ostentation than Mr. Pullman is reported to display, who began life as a miner in California, and who having bought some inventors' patents after the war, floated a company to operate them, and who, claiming the ownership of neither craft nor education, loves to be known as one of the few rich men of the day. Not one of the European cities already mentioned in France, Germany, or England, could be managed like Pullman City. Let us take Saltaire as the model which Mr. Pullman himself adopted for imitation in America, and which he followed so closely as, like Sir Titus Salt, the famous alpaca merchant, to acquire and to accept a title. It is not a crime to have a title, but it is a crime to oppress the poor or to use the title as a bandit uses his rifle.

In establishing Saltaire, Sir Titus Salt devoted himself to the erection of a model town for artisans. His chief aim was to combine the charms of comfort, the means of rational enjoyment, of domestic happiness, and of mental culture, with a well-intentioned effort to aid the people to help themselves. As Sir Titus Salt prospered in the world, his people in a becoming measure prospered also. He joined them at meetings and marriages, at sports and at banquets. As mayor of Bradford, he faithfully discharged his municipal duties towards them. He was so unpretentious a man that, while holding the office of mayor of Bradford, and enjoying the honors of an hereditary dignity and a seat in Parliament, he was often known to give a "lift" in his car to a poor workingwoman, carrying a basket of eggs to market. Sir Titus Salt thus made himself both popular and familiar with the wants of the people. He established a workingman's club, which was intended to sup-

ply all the advantages of saloons without their evils, and with the opportunities for an essential companionship for the people. He established technical schools to train young men and women in the arts and sciences. He furnished a gymnasium for physical exercise for the boys ; bagatelle and chess rooms for the men to amuse themselves in the evenings after work ; reading rooms, concert halls, and debating clubs were established. Everything which could draw out and develop human character or that furnished a meeting place for friendly resort for employer and employee, was done by Sir Titus Salt at his own expense. He purchased a park of fourteen acres on the banks of the river Aire, had it planted with choice trees and shrubs, intersected with pretty walks and promenades, tastefully bordered with flowers. In the center of this park, which gracefully sloped to the water's edge, was erected a raised pavilion that was occupied by the village folk on summer evenings, who were thus enabled to watch the children romp on the grass, or play cricket or other outdoor games. When the aged folk grew too old to work, or from any cause became destitute, they were not let loose like American tramps, to disgrace the nation, or to beg through the highways, or to sleep in hallways or in the outer air. They were placed in almshouses, in front of which were green terraces and flower beds ; honeysuckles, roses, or wild briar, peeped in at the windows in summer, while in winter the inmates had plenty of wholesome food, and warm, comfortable, if small and plain apartments. A chapel and infirmary, a postoffice, a savings bank, a horticultural society to educate the people how to grow and appreciate flowers, a glee and madrigal society, several coöperative societies where the families of the men purchased groceries or provisions and in the management of which they figured as shareholders, a brass band for the village—all these and many other things which I cannot now enumerate, were done by Sir Titus Salt, and the ownership of which was vested in a committee, one half the members of which were appointed by himself, and the other half elected by the employees.

How does Pullman compare with its headline, or Pullman

himself compare with Sir Titus Salt? Fortunately, I can speak of Pullman also from personal knowledge, having visited it in 1885 at Mr. Pullman's invitation. I was shown over the place by his superintendent, who, notwithstanding the secrecy with which everything seemed to be involved, enabled me to glean a good deal of its inner workings, of which nobody can learn anything material except duly vouched for by the "lord of the manor," or his private secretary, who was then a gentleman named Oppenheimer, if I remember rightly, and whose place I believe is now filled by a full-fledged German baron. I was not then much impressed with Pullman City, the pivotal principle of which seemed to be not to benefit the people, but to make money for the owners, workmen being regarded as a mere means to that end. Mr. Pullman seems to have started out with excellent intentions, but they appear not to have carried him very far. The tract which it comprises is three thousand five hundred acres in extent, on the shores of Lake Calumet, nearly all swamp land. Most of it, I believe, was purchased for less than \$200 per acre, and devoted to the Pullman works in 1880. By the aggregation of the houses of the people it is now worth \$5,000 per acre. After draining the land and laying off the town, Mr. Pullman, unlike Sir Titus Salt, wanted first of all to make money. He wanted, also, to take credit to himself for bringing out, so to speak, an American edition of the English experiment, particularly as most of the money in the Pullman Palace Car Company came from English shareholders.

If Mr. Pullman could harmonize the interests of labor and capital by some hocus-pocus jumble of seeming philanthropy and real greed—a philanthropy which the world would boom, and which, as an auctioneer would say, could be got "on the cheap"—truly he could pose as a marvel of American genius in the eyes of his English stockholders whenever he visited London. It was an age of advertising, and Mr. Pullman was shrewd. Accordingly, Pullman was laid out under approved plans, with the obvious purpose of making the biggest possible showing—a sort of *maximum perfectionis* for social man, with the least possible expenditure of money. Miniature lakes, attrac-

tive terraces, and fancy buildings—mere shells in structure, and occupying but little space, with no gardens in the rear and no grass plots in the front—were put up by the company and displayed to the best advantage. The generous provision made at Saltaire for the social life of its people was condemned or cavalierly cast aside at Pullman as “not being adapted to our American needs.” Like Saltaire, however, a park was formed and on the pleasant slopes of the lake beds were dug out and set with flowers in letters that spelled out the owner’s name, and which, confronting the visitor at every turn, never fail to remind him of the immortal name of Pullman. Pullman streets are beautifully planted and, on the whole, the natural features of the place, while by no means as inviting as Saltaire, half redeem the dreary view which is so artificially perfected as to give one the impression of a “machine-made” town. Mr. Pullman is a great believer in æsthetic notions, which prompted Oscar Wilde to design the “house beautiful,” and he esteems highly the advertising or commercial value of beauty. Accordingly, the windows in Pullman, or at least those that visitors are likely to observe, are tastefully ornamented with draperies. Potted plants stand flowering on the window sills, and a very unreal and false notion of the place is apt to be carried away by the visitor who merely drives through the principal streets and superficially sizes up the situation. For the truth about Pullman, one must live there and see with his own eyes; take nothing for granted.

The principal mercantile building in Pullman is a miscellaneous store termed the “Arcade.” It is 256 feet long, 146 feet wide, and abutting on its rotunda are arranged various offices, such as the Pullman Savings Bank, the public library, and the theater. All these are under one roof, with a balcony running all around the second story inside, from which, as from the gallery of the stock exchange, one may view the housewives of Mr. Pullman’s employees making their purchases below. This is the only store in the town. It is rented, as a matter of form, at a stiff price to some of the “bosses” of the Pullman works, and woe betide the poor man or his family who at some

time or other fails to patronize the "Arcade." The public school, which is not endowed by the Pullman Company, the market house, which is a sort of exchange not essentially different from the Arcade, the Pullman hotel, which is the saloon in the city and at which no poor man dare make his appearance, the church, and the water tower, are the other chief buildings in Pullman City. There is no workingman's club, there is no common playground for the people and their children, and no place for rational recreation, as at Saltaire. If one visits the theater, the prices range from thirty-five to seventy-five cents, and these rates, while seemingly moderate to people of means in large cities, are excessive in the eyes of the Pullman employees, who frequently have not one dollar a week after paying rent and can seldom afford the luxury of a first night. There are no almshouses where the infirm and aged, after spending out their years of toil, may rest in calm repose in the twilight of life. If they cannot work for Pullman, they may go begging on the railroads, and thus swell the great army of four million tramps—which our beneficent industrial system has produced as a counterpoise to the four hundred Pullmans, who practically own and rule this great country from ocean to ocean.

A material difference between Pullman and Saltaire is that while everything done at the latter is for the enjoyment and benefit of the people, and solely at the owner's expense, most of the things done at Pullman, though done by the Pullman Company and exclusively owned by them, seem to have been paid for by extortionate rates, by excessive work, and by exorbitant rents from the Pullman employees. The Pullman Company owns Pullman; the successive employees in the Pullman works ought to have the same share in the management of the place as the village folk of Sir Titus Salt possess in Saltaire. They have paid for the place at full cost. The idea of centralizing at Pullman is purely Pullmanesque. There is one store for all the people, where they buy or not as they please; if they do not buy, they may take the consequences at the hands of the bosses, who in Pullman are commonly called "spotters," and who constitute more than ten per cent of the workingmen.

Pullman is probably the best "bossed" city on earth, and Pullman bosses always look out for Pullman, and never for the people. They furnish reports that would be marvels of human villainy if revealed to the public, and pointers in methods of red tape to the government clerks at Washington. The blight of Pullman's satrapy is suspended like a black cloud over Pullman City, and crushes out the spirit of fun, of humor, and of independence from the hearts and thoughts of the people. Mr. Pullman, to do him justice, does not know the half of what occurs there, and, very much like an English king, he is the victim of the wiles and schemes of his courtiers. I have said there was only one store and one church in Pullman. There is not in the whole city of 12,000 people a single independent man—outside of Mr. Pullman, nor a single newspaper. Neither could exist in Pullman for a single day. What wonder that the men struck against a system which shames the very name of America? What wonder that European statesmen, seeing the vices of monarchical institutions reproduced in this country without any of their dignity or their virtues, should to-day point across the Atlantic to America as the greatest argument in favor of imperial institutions? What wonder that a distinguished public man should write of us thus: "I have studied the rapid evolution of social democracy in England. I have studied autocracy in Russia and theocracy in Rome, and I must say that nowhere, not even in Russia, in the first years of the reaction occasioned by the murder of the late czar, have I struck a more abject submission to a more soulless despotism than that which prevails among the masses of so-called free Americans when face to face with the omnipresent power of large corporations"? In striking against such a despotism as exists at Pullman, Debs and his followers have simply erected the first great finger-post of our time that distinctly points to the freedom and emancipation of the whole American people.

T. BURKE GRANT.

MILITARY INSTRUCTION IN SCHOOLS, COLLEGES, AND CHURCHES.

BY ALFRED H. LOVE.

LAFAYETTE Post of the Grand Army of the Republic, the Grand Army of the Republic itself, the Secretary of War of the United States, and ex-President Benjamin Harrison, in the January number of the *Century Magazine*, have come forward with resolutions, recommendations, and open letters for military instruction in public and private schools.

Without elaborating upon the religious phase of the question or more than quoting, "Thou shalt not kill," "Swords shall be beaten into plowshares," "Men shall learn war no more," which should satisfy all believers in the Old Testament that war is wrong; and merely quoting from the New Testament, "Return good for evil;" "Love your enemies," "Put up thy sword," "All who take the sword shall perish by the sword," and the teachings and life of the author of Christianity, which ought to satisfy all believers therein that not only war is wrong, but that the military system is inimical to the highest religious authority, we reply that we are surprised and pained that in the progress of the age, with national and international arbitration taking the place of the military system and deadly force, there should be any respectable effort made for military instruction, and especially in schools and colleges, and we may add in churches, for to the shame of so-called religious bodies, there are formed boys' brigades, drilled in military tactics with swords, guns, epaulets, and promotion according to proficiency, right under the eye of the minister and directly after his preaching "follow Jesus," emulate His example, and practice His virtues.

There is something cowardly in this plea for soldiers. There has been no civil war in the United States for over a quarter of

a century, or a foreign war, excepting the Mexican War, for over three quarters of a century. There is no necessity for a standing army. Wars do not "progress rapidly in modern times." There is no need of "filling the places of the Grand Army as their members pass away." "The peculiar institutions of this country," and we are glad they are peculiar to a republic and not like the monarchies of Europe, will be injured, as will the true democratic character of our institutions, and our liberties endangered, by giving "military training to our youth." "The strength and defense of our institutions" are not "to be found in the young who have received military training." There is no guarantee when we teach the young to fight that they will be loyal. Many of the graduates of West Point and other military academies turned their military knowledge against the very government that had paid for their tuition. So, too, in the Southern States, those educated in military life were the most desperate fighters against the Union. That military training does not insure loyalty, mark how the very guns of Dom Pedro were turned against him. Governments have been overthrown by the facility with which the army can be used against them. We take exceptions to the recommendation that "the scholars attending public and private schools, the high schools, and colleges, shall receive instruction in military matters," as well as to the recommendation "that legislative, municipal, and school board action shall be obtained for arms, equipments, and military instruction."

We are surprised that ex-President Harrison, after his address to the religious convention in Washington on the subject of peace, after his message to European powers in behalf of international arbitration, after his coöperation with Central and South American republics for no more war on the Western Continent, and his treaties of peace, after his experience in the peaceful adjustment of various difficulties, and after recommending a building for arbitration, should have written the open letter in the *January Century*. He says, "military instruction is good in every aspect—good for the boys, good for the schools, and good for the country." First, let us say we believe in one

code of morals for girls as for boys. Military training means that the Christian obligation shall be ignored in time of war ; that the soldier may lie, steal, maim, destroy, and kill ; that he shall return evil for evil, hate his enemy, starve him out, and and cut off his supply of water ; that he may subvert every commandment of the Old Testament and every beatitude of the New. Hence, military instruction directly excuses war ; it prepares for war and whets the appetite for war. Wherever there is a preparation for a thing, a practicing for that thing, it is very natural to seek opportunities to test that proficiency, and hence all this military preparation is a menace of war. One glaring objection to military drill in schools is, that it would thwart the object and office of a school, which is to teach children to hate that which is wrong and love that which is right.

Early impressions are lasting. We teach children to hate lying, stealing, treachery, destruction, maiming, and killing, as crimes against man and a sin against God. They do not become virtues because practiced on a larger scale or between different nations. Hence, ex-President Harrison, "it is not good for the boys."

It is not good "for the schools." What is a school? It is a place for intellectual training, and ought to be for moral training. The child goes from the home to school for the education of the mind. The school is made an ornament to our country by its developing the mental faculties of our children. How will it look to have one half of the pupils being drilled in military tactics, and the other half going on with their studies ; in other words, the boys taught that which is destructive, the girls that which is constructive? Is time so cheap that we can afford to take this portion of school life for instruction in that which will destroy not only what we build, but destroy life itself? Yes, and a schoolmate's life ; for under military law the soldier must obey man-made form, if ordered to fire his own house, shoot his own father, stab his own brother, or kill his own schoolmate. Hence, the school will suffer ; it will not be the home of intellectual learning and the bulwark of our institutions, because it would not be teaching the civil and moral

forces of our civilization. That it is not "good for the country", let us look at foreign countries; the young men that are trained for soldiers are taken from the peaceful walks of life. The country needs our strong, robust, and healthy boys to study the great political, civil, and intellectual needs of our government. Just in proportion as we take off of the civil strength and influence of trained power and subordinate it to military power, in that proportion we weaken the government; we burden it with military drill; we stultify it with military prominence; we ape the worst forms of monarchy; and we drift into military despotism. We do not want to be a huge military power. We never can cope with foreign nations, either in the army or navy, and we have no need to attempt it; the strength of our country rests upon a stronger foundation.

A nation that has an immense military force is always in danger from foes within and foes without. Jealousy is created with other nations, and any turn in political sentiments makes it easy to shift the army to one side or the other. Traitors may use the very means that were thought to be for protection. Without the swords and guns, the torpedo and the dynamite, the country is stronger and safer. If no reserve of carnal weapons, there will be the reserve of reason, common sense, arbitration, and all the civil, intellectual, and religious forces of our nature. Hence, ex-President Harrison, *military instruction* is not "good for the country."

We may agree in some measure as to the development of the physical, but cannot this be attained without the military part of the drill, which is the use of deadly weapons? Will not too great familiarity with them induce their use? Will not the carrying of concealed deadly weapons be increased? We have eminent authority for proving that the military drill does not develop all the muscles; that it is mechanical and automatic; that while some parts of the body are exercised, others suffer; that the freedom and health of the body are not promoted by the stiffness of the drill. Still, the good that is in the drill might well be utilized by both girls and boys, but, we implore, keep away the military phase. Ex-President Harrison says:

"The flag now generally floats above the schoolhouse, and what more appropriate than that the boys should be instructed in the defense of it?" We answer: If you mean "defense" by deadly force, that which invites attack, that which causes destruction, death, debt, ruin, we are sure such instruction is not appropriate. If the school is the school it should be, it will teach that the flag is an emblem of nationality, may be an emblem of humanity, that while it may inspire patriotism, it may extend that love of country and of mankind beyond national limits, until, as Garrison said: "All the world is my country, and all mankind my countrymen." The schools can teach that the best defense of the flag is in perfecting commercial relations, the postal system, the ministerial and consular appointment, the frequent intercourse between nationalities, the recognition of equal rights, human brotherhood, the sanctity of international marriage, the charity for different religions, in a word, that the flag should be an emblem of human brotherhood and peace.

The last paragraph of ex-President Harrison's letter starts with the proposition that, "If all the schoolboys of the North had, from 1830 on, been instructed in the schools of the soldier, precious time would have been saved in organizing the Union army in 1861."

We believe if this had been the case there would have been war much sooner, more frequently, and of longer duration. It was fortunate that our schoolboys had been taught the higher lessons of liberty and peace. Military life is a phase of slavery. Militarism is not republicanism. The individual is not allowed to think for himself; it is stolid obedience; it is one-man power; it is surrender of individuality; it is anti-American. Under the higher tuition of schools, as schools should be, volunteers for a good work will always be found. Under military rule, volunteers for bad work can always be found.

Of what use is school having the education of the mind for great courts, humane and, indeed, patriotic work, if it can be at the mercy of the bullet? If the well-educated boy when he arrives at manhood is to be food for powder, and he to have the

knowledge of how to kill and the presumed right to kill, because he has been taught in the schools of his country how to do it, of what use will knowledge be? Do we not expect the schools to give us a higher civilization? Do mothers give birth to children to kill and to be killed, and to be taught in school contrary to their teachings? Mother and home, God and school, first and ever!

Very true, ex-President Harrison, "the military taste and training acquired in the school will carry our best young men into the militia organizations," but they will not make those organizations reliable conservators of public order. It has not been the case in the past; it is not in labor troubles or in revolutions. It cannot be a reliable conservator of public order. Weapons of war and men-of-war, whether upon the land or water, are dangerous at all times, and we cannot see in the face of the great popular demand for courts and treaties of arbitration, why prominent men cannot say, give us physical exercise in gymnasiums, and all the arts of peace, and give us training in arbitration—when and how to arbitrate, where to introduce arbitration as a substitute for the military system, and emulate the wonderful power of man's mental and moral condition. There are undeveloped forces in our nature that need to be schooled, instead of fostering a barbarism handed down to us from the dark ages and now interwoven in our body politic, so that military men receive large pay for doing nothing, and, although to keep up the system and retain their positions, they invoke the school, the church, the people, and even our good ex-President Harrison to perpetuate it.

To think of Congress appointing a score of military officers to go into schools, to take the boys—remember, not the girls—off from the intellectual training into military training, diverting their minds from that which is for the instructive to that which is for the destructive! Thus, when our U. S. treasury is depleted, when the pension list is nearing \$200,000,000, when our army and navy expenses are nearing that sum, and yet a demand for more outlay when there is no necessity for it. No nation will go to war with this country if we do right. Let us

study, then, more and more to be right and to do right, and let the churches desist, in the name of all their professions, from drilling their Sunday-school boys into soldiers. Where is the American boy who will not see through the deceit, the hypocrisy, indeed the blasphemy, of preaching Christ, and then crucifying the very principles of peace, of which Christ was the type?

Let us see how far this hypocrisy of organizing boys' brigades in churches has gone. In England there is a total membership of 40,000. In the United States it is over 15,000. It was William A. Smith, of Glasgow, Scotland, who first organized in his church a military company of boys. Shall America adopt such foreign dangers? Why is it that our clergymen have thus been captured? The Baptist Boys' Brigade has over one hundred companies. Let us examine their work. The eligibility to the Boys' Brigade comes from membership in the Sunday school of the church. They must have a Bible class. We quote the published objects: "The advancement of Christ's kingdom among the boys and the promotion of all that tends to a true Christian manliness." The organization is: "A captain and lieutenants, drill under United States Army Drill Regulations, blue uniform and cross guns, cartridge box with the letters B. B. on the back, and a copy of the New Testament inside."

But there is nothing gained by pursuing particulars. Take this New Testament out of this cartridge box and read the Sermon on the Mount, repeat the Lord's Prayer and the profession of the church, and simply contrast all with this latest phase of military education. Then must come the answer that it is hypocritical, blasphemous, corrupting, and dangerous.

Let Congressman Outhwaite withdraw his bill "providing for an increase of the number of officers of the army to be detailed for educational institutions." Let General Scofield reconsider his recommendation to the secretary of war that, "the most important service the army can render in time of peace is to educate young men for service in the field in time of war," and let the churches, as one church in Massachusetts has already done, retrace their steps and refuse to countenance boys' brigades.

ALFRED H. LOVE.

THE OUTLOOK.

[Notes and comments concerning affairs of interest to intelligent and patriotic citizens. Address communications for this department to Outlook Department, American Journal of Politics, 114 Nassau Street, New York City.]

A FORWARD MOVEMENT.—From a communication recently mailed to members of the Institute of Civics, and having reference to “the possibilities of its second decade,” we quote as follows :

“It seems fitting that the Institute’s trustees should ask its members to assist in marking the tenth year of its work by a notable forward movement. Never have efforts such as those put forth by the members of this institution been so needful as aids to good government, right social order, and the welfare of all citizens. Existing political conditions emphasize the importance of the unity in good citizenship growing out of the enlightened and unselfish patriotism which inspires with common purposes and calls to common labors true men of every party, creed, and station. The perils attending the absence of this unity are everywhere evident; it is also clear that its existence demands something more than the influence of a negative good citizenship, or activities which are without common purpose and have no persistent force. More than all this—and a matter of paramount importance—the unity in spirit and purpose which shall secure the triumph of right principles generally, will not be the result of mere efforts to reform abuses, but of labors which shall reach the very springs of human action, and inspire the incorruptible manhood and intelligent devotion to right ideas, which are the essential characteristics of the ideal citizen. However useful its other activities, it is its devotion to the purpose last expressed which gives to our institution a *distinctive character*, as the first, and thus far the only, important national institution of its kind. However gratifying the results of its nine years of effort, they are chiefly encouraging as indicative of the incalculable importance of the work which it is within its power to accomplish through the appreciative and willing efforts of not merely thousands but tens of thousands of citizens like-minded in their devotion to exalted and worthy ideals.

“Some power within the coming decade must be resolutely exercised in the staying of the tides of civic corruption, or a hundred years may not suffice to lift the curse due to present neglects of duty. *The Institute of Civics summons American Patriotism to the exercise of this power.*

“As one means to the Institute’s larger success, the trustees are glad

to announce that under arrangements which will greatly widen its influence, the Institute will hereafter offer to its members a high-class monthly magazine, which will commend itself to public favor, not by sensational methods, but by the presentation of instructive, bright, and popular, as well as scholarly, articles upon the important civic questions which are of absorbing interest to intelligent and patriotic citizens; and will also have a department specially devoted to the objects of the Institute. Established by one of the Institute's councilors, and conducted with such conspicuous ability as to merit the statement of newspaper critics that 'it has marked out for itself a field in which it may be justly claimed that it has no rival,' this magazine, *THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS*, begins its fifth volume as the *official organ of the Institute*. A copy of the July number, mailed to every member, is an indication of what the magazine will be, and of the reinforcement which it will bring to the Institute.

"As heretofore, annual contributions to the Institute's expense fund will be voluntary, and those who cannot render such aid are asked to coöperate in other ways. *But every member who can do so is asked to contribute for the coming year not less than three dollars; and such members will receive the THE JOURNAL OF POLITICS (subscription price \$3) for one year without further cost.*

"Members may thus not only secure for themselves a valuable magazine, which will worthily represent and add to the influence of the Institute, but may increase *the Institute's expense fund sufficiently to provide for the more vigorous and efficient prosecution of its growing work.*"

This communication is signed by W. H. DePuy, Chairman; W. H. Arnoux, Cephas Brainerd, John I. Covington, C. H. Denison, C. N. Hoagland, L. A. Maynard, W. E. Sheldon, H. R. Waite, Executive Committee Board of Trustees.

CHRISTIAN YOUNG PEOPLE AND GOOD CITIZENSHIP.—At the beginning of the present year, the president of the Institute of Civics prepared and submitted to a number of the leading representatives of young people's organizations for Christian work, suggestions as to efforts by which it is thought the usefulness of these societies may be very greatly increased. The suggestions presented were in substance as follows:

"The American Institute of Civics represents a work undertaken by citizens of all religious creeds and political parties, with the purpose of reënforcing the qualities in citizenship which are essential to the highest success of our free institutions. I hardly need to urge the importance of such work; and surely nothing will more effectively promote the betterment of civic and social conditions everywhere than a general revival of intelligent and earnest Christian patriotism.

"If Christian citizenship is not the potent force in the promotion of civic and social good order and purity which it ought to be, it is because Christian obligations are not properly recognized and are not faithfully discharged in civic relations.

"To restore to the hands of those who represent the loftiest ideals of human duty the wholesome influence in affairs of citizenship and government which they have so largely lost by their own apathy, is obviously a matter of religious as well as civic concern. The Christian young people of America, the citizens who are just entering the field of civic activity, must meet and grapple with the serious political evils which now menace government and society. They cannot too soon or too thoroughly prepare themselves for their serious responsibilities; and such preparation requires adequate intelligence as to governmental and social conditions and needs, and the consecrated endeavors which shall meet and make provision for them in accordance with the noble spirit of the Christian patriotism which is a bond of union between citizens of all sects and parties.

"If these organizations are to contribute in any large and important degree to the work thus urged upon them by every consideration of patriotism and Christian duty, they must include it in their plans as one of their most important objects. The Institute of Civics, in the name of patriotism, asks these organizations and their local branches everywhere thus to embody in their plans faithful service of country, as a part of the service required at their hands in obedience to their Christian professions.

"The Institute freely offers to societies disposed to take up this work of duty, or to any of their members, whatever aid it can render by suggestions as to appropriate methods for the study and discussion of civic problems, or in other ways. Letters addressed to its offices, 38 Park Row, New York, will receive prompt attention.

"Christian endeavor in the field of good citizenship will receive due recognition in these pages; and in an early number of *THE JOURNAL* we hope to present suggestions as to 'How Young People's Christian Organizations may promote Better Civic Conditions,' furnished by distinguished clergymen and laymen."

POPULAR GOVERNMENT IN AMERICA.—"The only spot on the globe in which a civilized and enlightened people are building up new political institutions to suit themselves is in the United States of America. Australia comes near it, but is subject to the British Empire and to a Parliament in which she has no representation. Japan comes near it, but is still subject to a sovereign who has, in theory and form at least, most of the powers of a Roman emperor.

"Every American citizen is engaged in a grand experiment—that for which Washington declared it was his main purpose in accepting the presidency to secure a fair trial—to determine 'with what dose of liberty man can be trusted for his own good.' The authoritative leaders in this work are our public officers. Much of the best of it, no doubt, is done by private individuals, in the press, on the platform, before legislative committees; but such men are laboring for others to reap. Nor, at most, can they do more than propose the form of law and institutions. It is for those who administer them to turn form

into substance or into shadow."—Simeon E. Baldwin in the *Commercial Advertiser*.

UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF CIVICS.—The American University, Washington, D. C., which expects to begin active work in the autumn, proposes to have in its group of buildings a hall of philosophy, in which provisions will be made, among other departments, for a department of civics. The national capital affords exceptional opportunities for the success and commanding usefulness of a properly conducted school devoted to the special study of affairs relating to citizenship, government, and American institutions and ideas generally. No feature in the comprehensive plans of this projected "university of universities" will commend itself more thoroughly to the American public. It may embody the features of a school of statecraft in which young men with an honorable ambition to qualify themselves for the best possible service of their country in the many positions open to them, in connection with the civil lists of the general government, states, or municipalities, may pursue practical studies with the greatest possible advantage to themselves and the public. Nowhere else is it possible to secure the services of such a number of competent lecturers upon a great variety of civic and social questions as in Washington; and it is reasonable to suppose that the able and serious thinkers upon these questions, who may be found in the houses of Congress and in the various governmental departments, will be glad to contribute to the success of such a school by lectures upon subjects of which they have the largest information. In the matter of statistics, the study of the methods which alone can give exactness and value to deductions based on collaborated data, there is no place which affords such advantages for practical and valuable investigation. More than this, at no time in the history of the country has the need of schools of the character indicated been more evident. The ethics of citizenship, the paramount value of right character and due intelligence as to civic duties and obligations, governmental machinery, official qualifications, civic jurisprudence, civil order, serious economic problems, are among the many questions in civics to which the honorably disposed, earnest, and patriotic youth of America will feel themselves more and more called upon to devote special attention. It is to be hoped that the proposed University School of Civics in Washington may be established, and that it will realize its noble opportunity for nation-wide usefulness.

LOYALTY TO AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS.—Archbishop Ireland, in a recent address before the Loyal Legion in New York, said: "This country is America; only they who are loyal to her can be allowed to live under her flag, and they who are loyal to her may enjoy all her liberties and rights. Freedom of religion is accorded by the constitution; religion is put outside state action, and most wisely so; therefore the religion of a citizen must not be considered by voter or executive

officer. The oath of allegiance to the country makes the man a citizen; if that allegiance is not plenary and supreme, he is false to his profession; if it is, he is an American. Discriminations and segregations, in civil or political matters, on lines of birthplace, or of race, or of language—and, I add, or of color—is un-American and wrong. Compel all to be Americans, in soul as well as in name; and then let the standard of their value be their American citizenship." These words are commended to the attention of those who are asked to believe that Roman Catholics, without exception, are taught to be anything but loyal to our free institutions.

DERELICT VOTERS MUST PAY FINES.—Two general city elections have been held in Kansas City since a charter was adopted which contained a provision imposing a poll-tax of \$2.50 on every male citizen over twenty-one years old, the same to be remitted if he voted at the general election. No attention was paid to the provision, and nearly \$100,000 stands on the books against citizens who failed to vote. In a test case on the constitutionality of the law, Judge Gibson lately decided it valid, and that every tax could be collected with interest and costs.

COST OF WAR AND EDUCATION.—There is no better proof, says the *Journal of Education*, of the essential barbarism of even the most civilized nations of the world than is afforded by a comparison of the money they expend for the maintenance of physical supremacy as against the expenditure for mental improvement. Though it be assumed that brain is better than brawn, there is no evidence that statesmen so regard it. In some tables recently compiled, the amount per capita expended by various governments for military and educational purposes is set down as follows :

	Military.	Education.		Military.	Education.
France.....	\$1 00	\$ 70	Russia	\$2 04	\$ 3
England.....	3 72	62	Denmark	1 76	94
Holland	3 58	64	Italy	1 52	36
Saxony	2 38	38	Belgium	1 98	46
Württemberg	2 38	38	Austria	1 36	32
Bavaria.....	2 38	40	Switzerland	82	84
Prussia	2 04	50	United States	30	1 35

FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT IN NEW YORK.—The Good Government clubs in New York City held a convention June 28, in preparation for the coming municipal campaign. Sixteen clubs were represented by about one hundred delegates. W. Harris Roome, who was made chairman, said in his address: "Heretofore, except in the time of Tweed, reform organizations found themselves helpless. The sad mistake of too much compromise ruined their efforts and sacrificed their principles. We should keep the coming mayoralty election out of national politics. The gentlemen who are at the head of the national organizations are very sweet in their words, and possess a more profound knowledge of municipal politics than we do. The curse of municipal politics is the domination of national politics. We have an organization now of five thousand paying members who represent, perhaps, a

voting strength of ten times that number. We should find out a path over which every organization that is opposed to Tammany Hall may travel, and at the same time it is a duty to ourselves and to the sentiment of honest reform, to insist that our principles, and not the principles of any national organization, shall dominate this campaign."

The convention adopted the following platform :

"We, the representatives of the Good Government clubs of the city of New York, in convention assembled, reaffirm as the fundamental principle of these clubs, that municipal government is a matter of business administration, and should have no relation to state or national politics.

"We still support for municipal offices only candidates who are pledged to the principles of the Good Government clubs, and whose characters and careers inspire confidence in the sincerity of their professions. We believe that any defeat of Tammany Hall which is not also a victory for the principles of the Good Government clubs would not assure permanent good government, and would only substitute one master for another.

"We denounce the present administration of our city government as corrupt, wasteful, and tyrannical, and we charge Tammany Hall with being chiefly responsible for this condition.

"We declare our belief

"First—In the complete separation of municipal elections from state and national elections.

"Second—In local self-government for New York City; that is to say, the control of municipal affairs by the voters of the city whose interests are involved, and not by the legislature of the state.

"Third—In the strict application of civil service reform principles to the municipal service.

"Fourth—In election laws which will prevent fraudulent registration, protect the voter from bribery and intimidation, and secure a secret ballot and a fair and honest count.

"Fifth—In the strict enforcement of the naturalization laws.

"Sixth—In giving the chief executive of the city under existing conditions the power to remove, as well as the power to appoint, heads of departments.

"We are opposed to the creation of so-called bi-partisan commissions or boards in our city departments, as tending to bring partisan policies into the administration of such departments, and as an injustice to such of our independent citizens as may not be affiliated with either of the great national parties.

"We earnestly appeal to all citizens to unite in support of these principles and in the election of officials who will administer the city government without reference to national party politics."

AID TO SECTARIAN INSTITUTIONS.—One of the burning questions before the New York State Constitutional Convention, now in session, is that of state aid to sectarian institutions. The committees on edu-

cation, charities, taxation, and legislative powers have given a hearing on the question of the appropriation of public money for sectarian institutions. The particular amendment upon which the hearing was given is that introduced by Frederick W. Holls. It reads as follows :

"No law shall be passed respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, nor shall the state, or any county, city, town, village, or other civil division, use its property or credit, or any money raised by taxation or otherwise, or authorize either to be used for the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding, by appropriation, payment for services, expenses, or in any other manner, any church, religious denomination, or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking, which is wholly or in part under sectarian or ecclesiastical control."

The honest differences in the judgment of citizens of the highest intelligence and patriotism as to the wisdom of the proposed amendment, is illustrated by the fact that its introducer, and the most distinguished of its opponents, Hon. Frederick R. Condert, are both members of the Institute of Civics, and each actuated by the sincerest desire to promote the public good. Mr. Condert's arguments, submitted at a subsequent hearing, were most ably presented, and commanded the closest attention.

From his point of view, to the extent that religious denominations are engaged in the saving or reclamation of the homeless children and youth in our cities, by providing homes and giving them that training which will make them industrious and good rather than idle and vicious citizens, they are doing a work which is in the highest sense patriotic and promotive of the interests of the entire public. He pointed to the fact that the work which the churches, and especially the Roman Catholic Church, which more than any other is forced to care for the homeless young in our great cities, are doing, is a work for which no public provisions now exist, and which if undertaken under public direction would be done with results far less beneficial, and at infinitely greater cost. There seemed to him to be no sufficient reason why there should not be a reasonable measure of public coöperation in efforts which are so obviously necessary to the best interests of society. Mr. Condert was supported by Mr. George Bliss. Able opposing arguments were presented by Rev. J. M. King, D.D., secretary of the League for the Protection of American Institutions (which is devoted to efforts for the complete separation of church and state), and by whom the amendment was framed.

The most fruitful source of political evil, he said, was the unholy alliance of church and state, chiefly supported by the access of religious denominations to the public treasury. The proposed amendment was in line with the proposed sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in favor of which 300,000 autograph signatures had been forwarded to Washington at the suggestion of President Grant. Mr. Blaine introduced in the House a proposed amendment of a similar nature, which was adopted by an overwhelm-

ing vote, and was lost in the Senate by a narrow margin, failing to receive the necessary two thirds vote.

Dr. King quoted from the declaration of party platforms, Democratic and Republican, against the appropriation of public school money for sectarian schools. In twenty-three states constitutional provisions forbidding such appropriations now exist. The fact that controversies on the subject have arisen shows the necessity of a provision in the constitution of New York. The convention should not be alarmed by the cry of religious persecution. It was intended only to prevent any religious association from attaching itself to the state by financial bonds. A petition would be presented containing the names of 20,000 citizens of all denominations and parties, showing that the people are in favor of the change. He did not believe the committee would reject it. The amendment would preserve the character of the public schools, prevent the introduction of religious questions into politics, destroy the power of ecclesiasticism in public affairs, and confirm the separation of church and state.

Wm. Allen Butler, of New York City, said that freedom of religion in its broadest sense, freedom of worship, and the consequent absolute divorce of church and state, were the underlying principles of the nation. They were embodied in the constitution of every state in the Union. But, as often happens, the need of particular provisions had arisen, and this amendment was intended to supply such a need. If the public school system was to be absolutely free, then the line must be drawn and the principle of the separation of church and state practically applied.

The Right Rev. William Crowell Doane, of Albany, believed that all patriotic people should stand up for the principle embraced in the proposed amendment of Mr. Holls. He said that nothing was more to be dreaded than a conflict between church and state. He did not believe that even now any ecclesiastical control could follow the distribution of public school moneys, yet the question should be definitely stated by inserting this provision in the constitution.

Among other supporters of the amendment were Judge Wm. H. Arnoux and Gen. T. J. Morgan, of New York City, (members of the Institute of Civics). Judge Arnoux favored the principles of the amendment because the bestowal of sectarian appropriations is debasing to consciences of those concerned.

General Morgan said that it was absolutely necessary for the future security of our institutions that the separation of church and state should be definite, otherwise we might hereafter find our political parties divided on religious lines.

SHALL IT BE DONE?—Those who are interested in its objects and wish to promote them can materially increase the Institute's usefulness by presenting the names of citizens who may properly be asked to accept membership. A general response to this suggestion should enable the Institute to enter upon its second decade WITH ITS USEFUL-

NESS INCREASED FOURFOLD. Those who have aided largely in this way may be willing to do more; those who have not yet rendered such assistance have an opportune time for doing so now. A few additions secured by present members will make the whole number over TEN THOUSAND, thus fitly completing the Institute's TENTH YEAR. Shall the effort be made? Names may be sent by postal card or letter to Room 105, 38 Park Row, New York City. The Institute will courteously invite persons named to accept membership.

USEFUL ACTIVITIES.—The useful work accomplished by members of the Institute has hitherto been too little appreciated. With no suitable medium for presenting information as to their activities, what they have done, if it has come to the knowledge of the Institute's officers at all, has come to them only indirectly. It will be one purpose of the Institute, in this department of THE JOURNAL OF POLITICS, to present information as to what its own members (as well as others) are doing in the way of efforts, by voice, pen, or otherwise, for the needed betterment of political and social conditions.

Something to the point in this connection is an able address on "Good Citizenship," given in Austin, Texas, before the Texas State Union of Christian Endeavor, by Ira H. Evans, one of the Institute's representatives and a member of the corps of lecturers, the substance of which will appear in the September number of THE JOURNAL OF POLITICS. Mr. Evans' reference to the Institute has called forth letters from a number of Texas citizens, several of whom, as Institute members, have become active Christian endeavorers in the field of citizenship.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CIVICS.

DEPARTMENT OF POPULAR WORK.

Names and addresses of distinguished citizens, councilors of the Institute in the different states, who will entertain invitations to deliver popular addresses, lectures, or "talks" promotive of good citizenship, good government, and right social order.*

The Institute's annual announcement relating to this department of its work gives *encouraging evidence of progress*. The number of lecturers reported has increased nearly threefold, and there has been a corresponding increase in the demand for services such as they may render on the part of organizations of adults and youths, *secular and religious* gatherings, educational meetings, labor organizations, etc., etc.

In order to facilitate arrangements for securing such services in all

* Upon suggestion of members a few names have been added to this list just before going to press. The Institute ventures to include these without waiting to conduct the customary correspondence with the lecturers.

communities, the Institute asks its councilors throughout the states to forward to its president the names of resident citizens (whether members of the Institute or not) whose unprejudiced and impartial habits of thought, high-minded patriotism, and other qualifications, will enable them to render signal service in this connection.

Correspondence should ordinarily be addressed directly to the lecturers (preference being given to those nearest at hand), but the advice of the Institute's officers will be gladly given in connection with plans, and it is especially asked that some statement be sent to the Institute as to lectures delivered in order that it may publish in this department of THE JOURNAL full reports as to work thus accomplished.

It is proper to remark that the services of those who make lecturing altogether or in part a profession cannot ordinarily be asked or expected without reasonable compensation. Applicants should be explicit in their requests, and if they seek gratuitous services, should tender full payment of traveling and other expenses.

Lecturers who have not done so are earnestly requested to furnish, for publication in the Institute's Lecture Announcements, the subjects upon which they prefer to speak. The secretary of this department of work, Mr. Hughes D. Slater, manager of *Public Opinion*, will gladly answer any inquiries addressed to him by lecturers or by those requiring their services. Plans which will give enlarged importance and usefulness to the activities of this department will be announced in the September number of this magazine.

*Executive Offices American Institute of Civics,
33 Park Row, New York City, July 25, 1894.*

LECTURE CORPS.

- Adams, Hon. Brooks, Boston, Massachusetts.
 Adams, Prof. Henry C., Ph.D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
 Alderman, Edwin A., North Carolina State Normal College, Greensboro, North Carolina.
 Allen, J. H., Rockvale, Colorado.
 Allen, Prof. Charles H., State Normal School, San José, California.
 Allyn, Dr. Robert, President Southern Illinois State Normal Univ., Carbondale, Ill.
 "How We Govern Ourselves," "A Universal Ballot and the Obligations it Implies."
 Anderson, Rev. A. J., Ph.D., Walla Walla, Wash.
 Andrews, Rev. E. Benjamin, D.D., LL.D., Pres. Brown University, Providence, R. I.
 Atherton, George W., Ph.D., President Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
 Bacon, Prof. Thomas R., University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
 Baker, Hon. B. M., Superintendent Public Instruction, Austin, Texas.
 Bancroft, Hubert H., LL.D., San Francisco, Cal.
 Barrett, Jay Amos, M.A., 1611 Q. Street, Lincoln, Nebraska.
 "Ideals in Citizenship."
 Barringer, Prof. William N., Superintendent Education, Newark, N. J.
 "Reform in Municipal Government," "Education as a National Force,"
 "What Constitutes a Practical Education," "The Individual in Government."
 Beard, Prof. J. N., Napa College, Napa City, Cal.
 Bellamy, Francis, *The Youth's Companion* Building, Boston, Mass.
 Bemis, Prof. Edward P., Ph.D., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Bissell, Rev. J. W., D.D., President Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa.
 Blanton, Rev. L. H., D.D., Chancellor Central University, Richmond, Ky.
 Bouton, Eugene, Ph.D., Superintendent Schools, Bridgeport, Conn.
 Brooks, Rev. William M., A. M., President Tabor College, Tabor, Iowa.
 Broslus, Hon. Marriott, M. C., Washington, D. C.
 Brown, Hon. Leroy D., Ph.D., University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.
 Brown, S. Reid, A.M., St. Johnsville, N. Y.
 Buckham, Rev. M. H., D.D., LL.D., President University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
 Burdick, Hon. Francis Marion, LL.D., Columbia College Law School, New York City, N. Y.
 Boone, Prof. R. G., Superintendent Schools, Frankfort, Ky.
 Butler, Prof. Marion, Principal Salem High School, Huntley, N. C.
 Capen, Hon. Samuel E., Boston, Mass.
 "Problems in Municipal Government."
 Carothers, R. H., Editor *Educational Courier*, Louisville, Ky.
 Carrington, Gen. H. B., LL.D., U. S. A., Hyde Park, Mass.
 Carter, Capt. Lucian E., 410 Francis Street, St. Joseph, Mo.
 Case, Prof. Richard, A.M., Superintendent Public Schools, Red Bank, N. J.
 Childs, C. W., State Normal School, San José, Cal.

- Clark, Rev. J. B., Ph.D., Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
 Clayton, H. D., President University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Ala.
 Cleary, J. T., MacAlester College, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Coffin, Charles F., Superintendent Schools, New Albany, Ind.
 Conger, J. W., President Ouachita College, Arkadelphia, Ark.
 Cook, E. H., Ph.D., ex-President National Editorial Association, Flushing, N. Y.
 Cook, J. B., Greeley, Col.
 Cooper, Prof. Charles H., Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.
 Cooper, Hon. Oscar H., Galveston, Texas.
 Cumback, Hon. William, LL.D., Greensburg, Ind.
 Curry, Hon. J. L. M., LL.D., 1736 M. Street, Washington, D. C.
 Daniels, Prof. Joseph L., Olivet College, Olivet, Mich.
 Devore, Rev. Elcharles A., Union Christian College, Merom, Ind.
 Dozier, Melville B. P., State Normal School, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Duryea, Rev. Joseph T., D.D., 2402 Cass Street, Omaha, Neb.
 Edgar, Col. George M., President Industrial University, Fayetteville, Ark.
 Edwards, Rev. Richard, LL.D., Princeton, Ill.
 Eldridge, E. R., President Eastern Iowa Normal School, Columbus Junction, Iowa.
 "Public Education and Governmental Stability," "Republican Government and its Citizenship."
 Enright, Prof. John, Principal High School, Freehold, N. J.
 Estabrook, Prof. Joseph, Olivet College, Olivet, Mich.
 Evans, Ira H., Austin, Texas.
 "Good Citizenship."
 Farnsworth, Hon. Hiram W., B. A., Secretary Board of Education, City Building, Topeka, Kan.
 Fellows, Rev. S. N., D.D., State University, Iowa City, Ia.
 Folwell, W. W., LL.D., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Foster, William H., Geneseo, Ill.
 Foster, J. Ellen, Washington, D. C.
 Foss, Rev. C. W., D.D., Prof. Augustana College and Theological Sem., Rock Island, Ill.
 "Compulsory Education," "The Dangers of Hyphenated Americanisms,"
 "Municipal Government in the United States."
 Fox, Rev. Norman, D.D., Morristown, N. J.
 "Parties and Principles," "Political Education," "Christianity, the Pulpit, and Politics."
 Frisbie, Rev. A. L., D.D., Des Moines, Ia.
 Galbreath, Louis H., Instructor in Civics, Summer School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Garber, Judge John, 327 Pine Street, San Francisco, Cal.
 Gates, Merrill E., Ph.D., LL.D., President Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
 Gault, F. B., President University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.
 Gayley, Prof. Charles M., Berkeley, Cal.
 Gilman, N. P., Editor *Literary World*, Boston, Mass.
 Goodknight, Hon. Thomas M., B. D., First Assistant Department Education, Frankfort, Ky.
 Gove, Aaron, Superintendent Schools, Denver, Col.
 Graham, Prof. Robert, Kentucky University, Lexington, Ky.
 Greathouse, C. H., Editor *Home and School*, 352 Third Street, Louisville, Ky.
 Grier, Rev. W. M., D.D., President Erskine College, Due West, S. C.
 "American Politics and Moral Reform."
 Garrett, Hon. Franklin, Monroe, La.
 Hailman, W. N., Ph.D., Superintendent Indian Schools, Washington, D. C.
 Hale, Rev. Edward Everett, D.D., 39 Highland Street, Boston, Mass.
 Hall, Prof. Edwin L., Hiram College, Hiram, O.
 Halsey, Prof. John J., M. A., Lake Forest University, Lake Forest, Ill.
 Hawkins, Prof. W. J., Superintendent Public Schools, Nevada, Mo.
 Hays, Rev. George P., D.D., 13 McCormick Place, Cincinnati, O.
 Henderson, F. H. M., Superintendent Public Schools, Tallapoosa, Ga.
 Herron, Rev. George D., D.D., Grinnell College, Ia.
 Hoeshel, E. J., Campbell Normal University, Holton, Kan.
 Holcomb, V. E., Creighton, Mo.
 Holland, Rev. R. A., D.D., Trinity Rectory, New Orleans, La.
 Holland, Rev. W. J., Ph.D., President Western Pennsylvania Univ., Pittsburg, Pa.
 "The Education of a Citizen," "Courage and Industry."
 Hopkins, Rev. J. S., Ph.D., D.D., President Emory College, Oxford, Ga.
 Hopwood, Rev. J., Milligan College, Milligan, Tenn.
 Howison, Prof. George H., Berkeley, Cal.
 "The Real Nature of Representative Government," "Popular Fallacies Regarding the Principle of Representation," "The Nature of a State and of a Nation," "The Necessary Interdependence of Liberty and Law," "The Basis of Suffrage," "The Nature of Inalienable Rights and their True Inventory."
 Hudson, Edmund, Boston, Mass.
 "Municipal Lessons from Europe," "Workingmen's Homes in Europe," "The Capitol and Congress."
 Hull, Prof. John, President Wisconsin State Normal School, River Falls, Wis.
 Hughes, Prof. David E., Pierre Christian College, College City, Cal.
 Hunt, Prof. Leigh, Superintendent Schools, Corning, N. Y.
 Ingersoll, C. L., President Colorado Agricultural College, Ft. Collins, Colo.

- Ingersoll, Hon. Henry H., LL.D., Dean Law Department, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
- Irwin, John S., M. D., LL.D., Superintendent Schools, Ft. Wayne, Ind.
- Jack, Col. W. H., Natchitoches, La.
- Jenks, Prof. Jeremiah W., Ph.D., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
- "Economics," "Immigration," "The Negro Problem," "Election Methods in Different Countries," "Methods of Law Making."
- Jenckes, Rev. Joseph S., LL.D., 1044 North Illinois Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
- Johnston, William Preston, President Tulane University, New Orleans, La.
- Jones, E. N., Principal Plattsburg Normal School, Plattsburg, N. Y.
- Jones, Rev. Jenkin Lloyd, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
- Keasby, Prof. Lindsley M., Ph.D., R.P. D., Prof. Political Science, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
- Kellogg, Martin, LL.D., Berkeley, Cal.
- Kendall, F. M., A.M., Superintendent Schools, Jackson, Mich.
- Kephardt, Rev. J. L., D.D., President Westfield College, Westfield, Ill.
- Keyes, C. H., President Throop Polytechnic Institute, Pasadena, Cal.
- "Educating for Citizenship," "Ballot Reform," "The Machine in Politics," "The Initiative and the Referendum."
- Knight, George Wells, Ph.D., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- "Municipal Reform," "Administrative Reform," "Financial and Immigration Questions."
- Knox, Hon. T. J., Superintendent Schools, Jackson, Minn.
- Kratz, Prof. H. E., Superintendent Schools, Sioux City, Iowa.
- Lane, Albert G., Superintendent Public Schools, City Hall, Chicago, Ill.
- Lehr, H. S., President Ohio State Normal University, Ada, Ohio.
- Libby, Rev. Charles E., S. T. D., President Rust University, Holly Springs, Miss.
- "Political Rights and Duties of Citizens."
- Lippincott, Rev. Joshua, D.D., Lawrence, Kansas.
- Logan, Walter S., 58 William Street, New York City, N. Y.
- Long, Rev. Daniel A., D.D., LL.D., President Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio.
- "Socialism in our Colleges and Universities."
- Loughlin, G. H., LL.D., F.K., Sc., Garfield University, Kirksville, Mo.
- "The Sovereignty of the Nation," "The Nation and the Individual," "The Nation and the Family."
- Lyman, George A., Amboy, Ill.
- MacArthur, Rev. Robert S., D.D., Pastor Madison Avenue Baptist Church, 358 W. Fifty-seventh Street, New York City, N. Y.
- Mack, W. S., Superintendent Public Schools, Moline, Ill.
- Martin, Prof. D. S., Rutgers' Female College, 54 W. Fifty-sixth Street, New York City, N. Y.
- McAllister, James, Ph.D., President Drexel Institute, Philadelphia, Pa.
- McConnell, J. J., Atlantic, Iowa.
- McCord, Prof. W. E., Peoria, Ill.
- Mead, Edwin D., Editor *New England Magazine*, Boston, Mass.
- Milne, W. J., Ph.D., LL.D., Principal State Normal School, Oneonta, N. Y.
- Moncrief, J. W., D.D., Franklin College, Franklin, Ind.
- Morey, William C., Ph.D., Rochester University, Rochester, N. Y.
- Monroe, Prof. James, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.
- Morrison, Rev. N. J., D.D., President Drury College, Springfield, Mo.
- Moxom, Rev. Philip S., D.D., Springfield, Mass.
- "The Citizen's Duty to the City," "The Good Citizen."
- Murray, Rev. O. E., D.D., V.-P. Chicago Civics Club, Morgan Park, Ill.
- "The Little Red Schoolhouse," "Politics and Skeptics," "Misrule in American Cities," "Morals in Politics."
- Myrick, Rev. Henry Lewis, Sing Sing, N. Y.
- Nichols, J. B., Superintendent Schools, Mt. Vernon, Ill.
- Northrop, Rev. Cyrus, D.D., LL.D., President University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Northrop, B. G., LL.D., ex-Superintendent Schools State of Connecticut, Clinton, Conn.
- "The Home and the State."
- Obenchain, Maj. William A., A.M., President Ogden College, Bowling Green, Ky.
- "Our Heritage," "What Constitutes a Good Citizen."
- Ogg, Robert A., New Albany, Ind.
- Parker, Prof. W. D., State Normal School, River Falls, Wis.
- Parker, Col. F. W., M.A., Normal Park, Ill.
- Parkhurst, Rev. C. H., D.D., 133 E. Fifty-fifth Street, New York City, N. Y.
- Parr, Prof. S. S., Superintendent Schools, St. Cloud, Minn.
- "Currency and Taxes," "Merit Civil Service," "The Qualifications of Citizenship."
- Payne, Rev. C. H., D.D., LL.D., 150 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
- Payne, W. H., Ph.D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Peabody, Dr. S. H., 4200 Berkeley Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- Peabody, Rev. H. H., D.D., Rome, N. Y.
- Pearson, F. B., MacAlester College, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Pepper, Rev. George D. B., D.D., Waterville, Me.
- Peters, Rev. Madison C., D.D., Pastor Bloomington Reform Church, Broadway and Sixty-eighth Street, New York City, N. Y.
- "The Fate of Republics," "Shall Rum Rule America?"

- Potter, Rev. E. N., D.D., LL.D., President Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
 Pratt, Rev. Lewellyn, D.D., 148 Broadway, Norwich, Conn.
 Prentice, W. R., Elmira, N. Y.
 Raab, Hon. Henry, Superintendent Public Schools, Springfield, Ill.
 Rainsford, Rev. W. S., D.D., 209 E. Sixteenth Street, New York City, N. Y.
 Randall, Daniel R., Ph.D., Annapolis, Md.
 Reid, Prof. W. T., A.M., Belmont, Cal.
 Roberts, Hon. Ellis H., LL.D., 15 W. Twentieth Street, New York City, N. Y.
 Robinson, Prof. Franklin C., LL.D., Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
 Rogers, William O., Tulane University, New Orleans, La.
 Rogers, Prof. L. C., Department Civics, Alfred University, Alfred Center, N. Y.
 Round, W. M. F., 65 Bible House, New York City, N. Y.
 Schaeffer, Rev. N. C., Ph.L., Superintendent Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pa.
 Seovel, Rev. S. F., D.D., President Wooster University, Wooster, O.
 "The Limitations of Liberty," "The Enforcement of Moral Legislation,"
 "Law and Morals," "The American Idea of Religion and the State," "Ameri-
 can and Foreign Institutions and Life Compared."
 Searing, Edward, LL.D., President State Normal School, Mankato, Minn.
 Sessions, F. J., Superintendent Schools, Lime County, Marion, Ia.
 Sewall, Frank, 1618 Riggs Place, Washington, D. C.
 Shaw, Albert, Ph.D., Editor *Review of Reviews*, New York City, N. Y.
 Sheldon, Hon. W. E., 3 Somerset Street, Boston, Mass.
 Shepherd, Rev. Robert D., D.D., Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
 Sherman, Hon. E. B., LL.D., President Chicago Civics Club, Monadnock Building,
 Chicago, Ill.
 Skillman, Rev. William Jones, A. M., Editor *Sioux Falls Journal*, Sioux Falls, S. D.
 Skinner, Hon. Charles R., State Conductor Teachers' Institutes, Albany, N. Y.
 Slade, Hon. James P., Greenville, Ill.
 Smith, Gen. J. A., Jackson, Miss.
 Smith, Hon. Hannibal, Watertown, New York.
 "The Relation of Religious Freedom to the State."
 Snow, Prof. Marshall S., LL.D., Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
 Spayd, H. H., Principal Public Schools, Minersville, Pa.
 Sperry, Prof. Willard C., Olivet College, Olivet, Mich.
 Stevens, Prof. Edward L., Chateaugay, N. Y.
 "An Experiment in School Civics," "The School of the Citizen."
 Stevenson, Prof. W. F., Wichita, Kan.
 Stockwell, Hon. Thomas B., State Superintendent Public Schools, Providence, R. I.
 Scott, W. T., President Franklin College, Franklin, Ind.
 Stratton, Rev. C. G., D.D., Mills College, P. O., San Francisco, Cal.
 "Political Economy," "The History of the Constitution of the United States,"
 "International Law."
 Swett, Prof., Principal Girls' High School, San Francisco, Cal.
 Swing, Rev. David, 68 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 Taylor, A. R., Ph.D., President State Normal School, Emporia, Kan.
 Taylor, Frederick, 47 West Seventy-third street, New York City, N. Y.
 Terrett, Rev. William Rogers, D.D., Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
 Thomas, T. W., Bowling Green, Ky.
 Thompson, Hon. Hugh S., LL.D., 160 Broadway, New York City, N. Y.
 Thompson, Daniel Greenleaf, Secretary Department Legislation, American Institute
 of Civics, 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 Tillotson, D. C., Superintendent City Schools, Topeka, Kan.
 Turner, E. M., Ph.D., Morgantown, W. Va.
 Von Coelin, Hon. C. W., Des Moines, Ia.
 Waite, Henry Randall, Ph.D., President American Institute of Civics, 38 Park Row,
 New York City, N. Y.
 "The Sovereignty of Manhood," "The Scholar in Politics," "Politics With-
 out Religion," "True Americanism."
 Whitling, Prof. Harold, Berkeley, Cal.
 Whiton, Rev. James M., Ph.D., 43 W. Forty-seventh Street, New York City, N. Y.
 Wilder, Amos Parker, Ph.D., Republican Club, New York City, N. Y.
 "Total Abstinence from the Standpoint of Civics and Christian Expediency,"
 "Ideals in Journalism," "Immigration."
 Williams, Prof. S. G., Ph.D., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Willits, Hon. Edwin, President Michigan Agricultural College, Lansing, Mich.
 Wilson, Prof. Woodrow, Ph.D., LL.D., Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
 Wilson, Hon. James S., United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
 Winship, Rev. A. E., Editor *Journal of Education*, Boston, Mass.
 Woodford, Prof. A. B., Ph.D., School of Social Economics, 31 Union Square, New
 York City, N. Y.
 "Who Pay the Taxes?" "Are We a Plutocracy?" "How Shall Immigration
 be Restricted?" "Good Government Clubs."

All communications having relation to the work of this department
 should be addressed, American Institute of Civics, Department Popu-
 lar Work, 38 Park Row, New York.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS.

SEPTEMBER, 1894.

GOOD CITIZENSHIP.

BY IRA H. EVANS.

CHRISTIANITY must be an all-pervading force in the lives of those who believe in it to fully accomplish its mission, and unless it makes better citizens of those who enlist under its banner than are others, we must confess that it has partly failed to accomplish its proper work among men.

Has there not been something lacking in the education of all of us in respect to these matters? Where is the line of demarcation found between Christians and non-professors of Christianity in the performance of their civic duties? Do they usually vote together indiscriminately for the same men and the same measures in city, county, state, and national elections? Which has the greatest influence with the average Christian voter, his party associates and feeling of partisanship or his sense of moral obligation to vote against bad men and bad measures, by whomsoever nominated? Who are the most active and vigilant in the conventions that nominate and the elections that decide who shall be our city and county officers, the saloon-keepers, gamblers, and other representatives of the evil forces of society, or the Christian citizens? It is a notorious fact that ordinarily the former exhibit the most activity and interest in these matters, and it is equally notorious that they are usually successful in their efforts.

What is usually at stake in such elections? Stated in the fewest words possible, it is good or bad government. To be more specific, it is the question of an honest and capable administration of public affairs in the interest of the people, and the

suppression, as far as possible, of the evil forces in society, or it is a corrupt and incompetent administration of public affairs in the interest of a few, and the letting loose upon society of all its forces to corrupt, debauch, and destroy as many as possible of the people. Whatever be the result, the end accomplished is great for good or evil.

Occasionally here and there a community has a virtuous spasm, and a period of municipal house-cleaning ensues ; but such a period is seldom long lived, and soon matters go on again in the same bad old way. The evil forces of society are always organized, alert, and aggressive, well supplied with money to carry their end, and unscrupulous in its use. With the greatest skill and cunning they work through all party organizations, contribute liberally to campaign funds, are busy in the primaries in securing the nomination for office of their friends, are diligent in seeking to control the utterances of the newspapers in favor of their candidates and measures, and are most active in getting the voters to the polls in their own interest on election day. While ostensibly the most earnest of political partisans, they really care nothing at all for any political party, except to use it for their own ends. Nominally members of different parties, their votes are practically a unit for the candidates of any party which will be most useful to their interests.

Against this combination of evil forces, so powerful for ill, what do we commonly see on the other side ? The better elements of society are usually unorganized, or with an organization of little force, often sadly indifferent to moral results, and frequently deceived as to the real character of more or less of the men they support for office. It is a favorite trick with these enemies of society, in cases where it is deemed best to pay some respect to the moral element of the community, to select for the most important offices good-natured, popular men who stand fairly well in society, are well connected, and not infrequently are church members, but who have no more backbone or moral force than an oyster. Money and official position often make such men available for bad ends, and I believe there is scarcely a city of any considerable size where you may not find some such men

placed in office in the manner described. Why are not the Christian and moral forces of society as united for the support of good men and good measures in elections as are the evil forces of society for the support of bad men and bad measures? The answer to this question may be that the evil forces of society feel a more direct interest in the results of such elections, because the successful pursuit of their various lines of evil work depends largely upon the acquiescence of the officers of the law in their violations of law.

{ If we wish to have good government we must first have good citizenship for its support. The good citizen is one who has sufficient intelligence to understand his civic duties, who takes as much interest in public affairs as do the saloon-keeper and gambler, and who has sufficient manhood and moral courage to vote for or against men and measures on their real merits, regardless of the fact that they are supported or opposed by any particular party or set of men. } He is first of all a patriot. He loves his own country with ardent devotion and is most jealous of its honor. He honors the memory of the noble men who, amid unexampled hardships and sufferings, here founded and nurtured the institutions of civil and religious liberty.

The good citizen is a law-abiding citizen. He does not simply obey a law because he likes it, but he obeys it because it is the law. He fully realizes the fact that our institutions can only be maintained through the supremacy of the law. In his farewell address to his countrymen it would seem as if Washington had been gifted with prophetic vision to warn all coming generations of Americans of the greatest dangers against which they must guard their country if they would preserve its free institutions. Among other things he said :

The very idea of the power and right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put, in the place of the

delegated will of the nation, the will of a party ; often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community ; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill-concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils and modified by mutual interests.

Did he foresee what we now unfortunately see—the organization of lawless mobs, under the leadership of political blather-skites, to march on Washington and seek to control and direct the legislation of Congress ?

In his memorial oration at Philadelphia in 1887, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the framing and promulgation of the national constitution, Judge Miller of the United States Supreme Court said :

The Anglo-Saxon race, from whom we inherit so much that is valuable in our character as well as our institutions, has been remarkable in all its history for a love of law and order. While other peoples, equally cultivated, have paid their devotion to the man in power, as representative of the law which he enforces, the English people, and we their descendants, have venerated the law itself, looking past its administrators, and giving our allegiance and obedience to the principles which govern organized society. I but repeat the language of the Supreme Court of the United States when I say that in this country the law is supreme. No man is so high as to be above the law. No officer of the government may disregard it with impunity. To this inborn and native regard for law, as a governing power, we are largely indebted for the wonderful success and prosperity of our people, for the security of our rights ; and when the highest law to which we pay this homage is the constitution of the United States, the history of the world has furnished no such wonder of a prosperous, happy, civilized government.

Let me urge upon my fellow-countrymen, and especially upon the rising generation of them, to examine with careful scrutiny all new theories of government and of social life, and if they do not rest upon a foundation of veneration and respect for law as the bond for social existence, let them distrust them as inimical to human happiness.

Disregard for law is becoming a common thing in our land. It is one of the most painful and significant features of our time that nearly all our labor organizations are ready at any time to defy the laws of the land and to commit acts of violence to carry their ends. There is hardly a labor strike in our land that is not accompanied by violence, and frequently by murder.

and arson. The daily papers are filled with accounts of their lawless acts in different parts of the country. There is nothing on earth more despotic than these labor organizations whose members are ready to maim and kill any man who, in the exercise of his rights as an American citizen, dares to work in violation of the behests of such organizations. No one questions the right of any number of people to organize for any lawful purpose, and I doubt not these organizations possess beneficent features, but there can be no good excuse for their lawless acts in trampling upon the rights of person and property of other citizens. For all their wrongs, whether real or fancied, they have their remedy through the courts and the ballot box, as have all other citizens, and these are the only means for righting wrongs known to our form of government. By their violent deeds they are pulling down the columns which support the fabric of our government; and when the crash comes, which they, perhaps unwittingly, are doing their utmost to produce, none will be greater sufferers by it than themselves and their families. With the success of their efforts mob law will prevail, and for a time murder and rapine will fill the land with inconceivable misery, and then "the man on horseback" will inevitably appear and be hailed as the savior of society, for the rule of one strong man is infinitely preferable to the rule of the mob. Such has been the history of the world in the past, and such we may reasonably expect it to be in the future under similar conditions.

In a government like ours, of the people and by the people, the step from the supremacy of law to anarchy is but a short one, and it is easily taken through unchecked violations of law. Why is there such imbecility in the most of our state and city governments in dealing with acts of lawlessness? It is because the people elect for their officers men who either sympathize with the lawbreakers or who lack the manhood and moral courage to enforce the laws they are sworn to execute. These recreant officials evidently think they have more to fear from the resentment of the lawbreakers and their sympathizers in case they enforce the law than from the just indignation of the

law-abiding citizens in case they suffer the laws to be trodden under foot. \ Back of all, the trouble is largely the indifference to their civic duties and lack of sense of responsibility for the conduct of the government, of the individuals who compose what are termed the better elements of society. \

The nation must be governed by one or the other of the great political parties which owe their origin to opposing views among the people as to the powers of the government and the policies to be pursued by it. These parties extend into our state politics, and national politics too often absorb almost the entire thought and attention of the people to the exclusion of proper attention to state affairs. Most unfortunately for the interests of the people, our county and city governments have usually been included among the prizes to be struggled for by these great political parties, and the winner has generally regarded the control of the city or county government as a prize captured in war, to be appropriated to the benefit of the victor, instead of a trust to be administered for the benefit of the people.

The offices in city and county governments have no connection whatever with the national or state issues upon which the people are divided, yet they are given to the most active partisans of the successful political party, with scarcely any regard to their fitness for the places they fill. These offices are usually regarded as places to be filled by partisan mercenaries. American cities of considerable size are well known to be the most shamefully misgoverned cities in the civilized world. They are usually governed by rings of corrupt politicians, who are in close alliance with the saloon-keepers and gamblers and all the evil forces present in such communities. Strange to say, very many good people are so steeped in partisanship that they vote for the nominees of these rings because they control the regular local party organizations to which they belong.

{ The hope for better city and county governments in this country consists largely in separating them altogether from any connection with national and state politics, and treating them simply as business corporations, to be managed on an entirely non-partisan basis for the benefit of the people. Our city and

county governments are those nearest to us, and are those which most vitally affect our welfare and in which the greatest opportunities exist for the abuse of power in the matters of taxation, extravagant and corrupt expenditure of public funds, and maladministration of the law in the interest of the lawbreakers. The movement cityward is revolutionizing the conditions of American life, and unless there is a purification of our cities they will become centers of corruption which will poison the life of the whole nation. Happily municipal leagues and good government clubs are being organized quite extensively to meet this threatening condition of affairs. The war is on all over our fair land between the forces who seek good and bad government. Organization must be matched by organization if we would succeed. We must work as hard in the unselfish effort to maintain good government as do the evil forces of society in their selfish efforts to destroy all that is valuable in our Christian civilization. The saloon-keepers and liquor dealers have their state organization and also their local organizations to carefully protect their interests from any hostile state or local action, and many of their friends are organized into societies in behalf of that much-abused term, "personal liberty," for the support of the saloons and the destruction of the quiet and peace of the American Sabbath. With the cry of "personal liberty" in our ears in behalf of the saloons, which exist to debauch and destroy American youth and manhood, we may well exclaim with Madame Roland, "O Liberty! Liberty! how many crimes are committed in thy name!" Milton well said of this kind of liberty: "License they mean when they cry liberty." Rather let us agree with Burke, in his "Reflections on the French Revolution": "What is liberty without wisdom and without virtue; it is the greatest of all possible evils; for it is folly, vice, and madness without tuition or restraint."

The open saloon is the great curse of America, and it is a great cancer eating into our body politic. Where it cannot be suppressed its evil influences should be limited as far as possible. A distinguished clergyman who studied the liquor question abroad for some years recommends the Norwegian sys-

tem of regulating this traffic. He says that "the only way to overcome the liquor power is to break the alliance of the passion for gain with the passion for drink, and the alliance of both with politics. Gambling, lust, and drink passions are bound together; while they so remain prohibitory laws will not destroy the saloon. In Sweden and Norway, under the Norwegian system, saloons have decreased more than sixty per cent, and liquor drinking more than one half." What a mighty power the liquor interest wields in divorcing people from the church of God and in sowing in their minds the seeds of lawlessness and anarchy, which so soon ripen into lawless and bloody deeds! The fact that gamblers nearly always have their places of resort over saloons is significant of the intimate relations existing between them. One class is licensed to depredate on society, while the vocation of the other is prohibited; but both alike despise and disobey the laws.

The hope of the country for the purification of its politics is in the independent voter who can neither be bribed, cajoled, nor coerced into voting for what he believes to be wrong. It is not strange that he is both hated and feared by the corrupt professional politicians. The independent voter is becoming the saving element in American politics. May his tribe speedily and largely increase. Listen to the wise counsels of Washington to his countrymen upon this subject:

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual, and sooner or later the chief of some pre-

vailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty. The common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

The material, social, and political conditions of this country have been powerfully affected by the enormous influx of foreigners in the last twenty-five years. During that period 10,421,715 immigrants have entered this country. There is nothing in this world's history to compare with this mighty movement of people, either as to the diversity of nationalities and vastness of numbers engaged in it, or greatness of distance traversed in effecting it. Every habitable portion of the globe has contributed to it. With the exception of the Chinese, all the male adults among them have been invited to exercise the elective franchise after a residence in the different states and territories of periods ranging from three months to two years. Only four states require a longer period of residence than one year for this purpose. The immigration for the period stated has been drawn mostly from the poorer and more ignorant classes of Europe. Swarms of the most degraded people of Europe have been imported to work in the mines and mills and on the railroads of the country, displacing better paid and more intelligent labor. The capitalists who have imported these people have been animated by an inordinate greed for gain in so doing, and apparently have cared nothing at all for the evil results to society of such action. We may wonder what Mr. Carnegie, who wrote in such glowing terms of "Triumphant Democracy," now thinks of the partial exhibition of it by the hordes of Poles, Slavs, Italians, and Hungarians imported by himself and his associates, who are pillaging, burning, and murdering in Pennsylvania. City and parish authorities in Europe have been found aiding in sending to us their paupers and criminals, and even private societies abroad have recently been discovered carrying on this shameful work. The assassins of Italy, driven out of that country, find their homes here, and the murderous Mafia has been established in our country. The anarchists and other enemies of society, driven out of Europe, come here to

preach their devilish doctrines and recommence their fiendish work on American soil. This country is fast being made the Botany Bay of Europe.

These immigrants, unused to any participation in government affairs, ignorant of our language, laws, and customs, and thinking only of improving their material condition in coming hither, have become a potent factor in our American life, and have undoubtedly done much to lower the standard of American citizenship and degrade American politics. They swarm in our cities, and by their votes are largely responsible for the maintenance in power of the "rings" which plunder and misgovern so many American cities. They have largely increased the purchasable vote in this country and are generally stanch supporters of the saloons, both in business and politics. They largely control the trades unions and labor organizations of the country, whose places of meetings are usually found over saloons or in connection therewith. Many of these newcomers mistake liberty for license, and are largely responsible for the lawless and murderous deeds now so commonly incident to the strikes of labor organizations. Accustomed to military repression in Europe, they have an utter contempt for our weak civil authorities, and bullets and bayonets alone command their respect. They constitute the main strength of the anarchists in America, whose favorite places of resort are naturally the saloons, and in their mad efforts to abolish all government and destroy society itself, they cry out for "personal liberty" even more loudly than do the saloon-keepers and their allies. While many good men are included among these immigrants who are an honor to this country and whom we gladly welcome to the privileges of its citizenship, still the general result of this vast inflow of heterogeneous elements has been disastrous to the best interests of our country.

At the same time we must remember that these people are not to be blamed for coming hither. They came because our doors were wide open for their admission, and they are voters because we gave them the ballot without any regard whatever to their fitness to use it wisely. The real fault is with us and

not with them. In the wild race for material prosperity with which the people of this country have been largely crazed since our civil war, our main thought has been of growth in wealth and population, and the development of our vast natural resources. We have been a nation of money-seekers instead of a Christian and patriotic people. With a fatalistic belief that God would in some way take care of our country, we have been permitting it to go to the devil. If the present financial depression in our country, accompanied as it is by so much suffering and so many acts of violence, shall serve to arouse the American people to a serious consideration of their present condition and its causes, and result in a genuine revival of Christianity and patriotism, we shall have occasion to thank God that we have been afflicted in mercy.

We have trusted too much to the theory that education alone will make a good citizen. Experience shows us that such is not the case, and that intelligence divorced from religion and morality only serves to make its possessor more dangerous to society. In our anxiety to disarm hostile criticism of our public schools, we have banished the Bible and every form of religious instruction from them, and have gone so far that scarcely any moral instruction is given in them. A distinguished educator has well said :

I believe that the course of study in our public schools ought to include direct moral instruction. There ought to be text-books and teaching on practical morality. By moral instruction I mean instruction as to doing right in the relations of man with man ; instruction concerning the common duties of life, what they are and how to do them. In these matters I claim that all the pupils in the public schools ought to receive instruction.

Two facts that are unquestionable tend to confirm this conclusion. One is that the public school system has constantly tended more and more to become an intellectualizing machine. This is the tendency and danger of the system. It omits moral instruction, for the most part, and devotes itself to the intellect, and the consequence is that the thinking powers are developed at the expense of the conscience, and intellectual pursuits come to be valued by the young at the expense of practical duty. This danger of attending exclusively to the intellect is the snare of our public schools. It is a danger that must be watchfully guarded against or the schools that were meant to bless the commonwealth will minister to its worst tendencies. And the other fact,

complementary and confirmatory, is that public schools have not thus far fulfilled the expectations of their friends in the promotion of public morality. Many have thought that general education was the surest road to general reformation, just as Lord Macaulay predicted, in his enthusiasm for the government schools in India, that after they had been thirty years at work not a heathen would remain in all that land. But the thirty years have more than passed and the idols still stand; nor have similar predictions been better fulfilled elsewhere. Illiteracy and crime used to be thought of as companions, but the day of such association is passing away. A larger proportion of prisoners is made up of persons under twenty-five years old than when public schools were in their infancy. The fact seems to be that our schools have developed a class with quick wits, but dull consciences, able to do sharp things, but indifferent to moral restraints; and this class sends an excessive proportion of its members to prison. They were taught the use of their wits but not their duties, and the consequence is what might have been foreseen. If the schools do not wish to minister to public vice they must begin to minister directly to public morality by teaching the actual duties of common life.

Another necessity, in order to the improvement of moral culture, as I believe, is industrial education in the public schools.

Here again we should remember that public education is intended to fit the pupils in some good measure for the life that is before them. And it should be added that labor, daily labor, is to be the life-long lot of the great majority of those who attend the public schools. It follows that the training they receive in school should prepare them in some way for a life of labor. If our schools set themselves to the training of a leisured class, they will not only defeat their own true object, but become a curse to the country.

Here we meet another danger from the tendency, inherent in a school system, to over intellectualizing—the danger of educating children away from their life. Of course, it is most desirable that some children should be educated away from the life in which they seem to have been born. It is one glory of the public schools that they help to draw the select few out from among the many to a more intellectual life than the many can live. But it is easy besides for the school to create in the many such tastes and habits as will disqualify them for the life that is before them. Children from the families of laboring men are brought under public education. They come under influences that stimulate the taste for intellectual activity. They are taught that to think, to learn, to know, are the great things. They are fascinated with the idea. They do not learn enough to be very wise, but they do learn enough to think that intellectual pursuits are essentially higher than labor. Conceit of knowledge is easier to get than knowledge, and always comes earlier. When their life in school is ended intellectual habits have been crudely begun, and industrial habits have no existence. Very likely the best years for the formation of habits of industry and the learning of a trade have passed. The school has done

nothing toward training the hands to skill in ordinary work. It has unintentionally instilled the idea that wit is better than work to get a living by, and has thus encouraged a proud revolt from the life to which they were born, while yet it has not fitted them for any other. Thus it comes to pass that so many who have passed through our schools are looking for light work or work that seems genteel, or are rushing half educated into the professions and lowering the standard of learning there. Thus it happens, too, that there are recruits in abundance for the army of those who live by their wits, whether honestly or not, and often fall into the clutches of the law.

Very sad and suggestive is the remark of a prison commissioner, that half the benefit of prison life to youthful criminals consists in the formation of habits of patient industry. Why should we leave so great a benefit to be conferred by prison life? Why should society give it only to the criminals? What if the schools gave some of it to all who came within their walls? Is not prevention better than cure? Is not a child saved to industry better than a criminal won back to it by the incidental benefit of his penal shame? Grant that the schools cannot do everything, and cannot do anything very great in this direction; nevertheless, what they can do is well worth doing. What can they do? In answer I may ask, why should it not be one of the duties of the public school to train the hands of the children to deftness and skill in working? These wonderful hands that God has given us—how little of the work that is possible to them do they do, for want of skill! If they had been wisely trained and practiced in our childhood, so that their utmost had become possible to them, how much better had we been fitted for the daily necessities of our lot! As for the great multitude who must use their hands in some way or other all their days, even a little manual practice, substituted for complete disuse in school-time, would have done them more good than some part of the Roman history that they tried to learn. In this working world, why should not power to work stand among the first lessons that society teaches to its young?

In some cities the first steps of learning and practice in some of the leading trades are already taught in the public schools. Wood work in its various forms, practical and ornamental, from carpentry to carving, is taught under the auspices of the public boards, to the great benefit of the rising race. Slowly, but surely, this work is destined to increase; not to the exclusion of the present work of the schools, by any means, but so far that labor shall be recognized as a constant subject of instruction, and the great mass of workers shall find the schools direct help in preparation for their life.

Such instruction would tend at once to improvement in the moral tone of the schools themselves. That school will have the best moral tone which best serves its true end. The effect of education that trains the young away from sympathy with their own life and duty is morally confusing and depressing. If a school ministers to pride of intellectual pursuits and contempt of labor, the moral tone of it is un-

healthy. One of the most direct ways to purify and elevate the moral spirit of our schools is to bring them into line with the actual work of life ; to recognize the fact that man is destined to be a laborer as well as a thinker and a learner ; to put honor upon labor by keeping it constantly in sight as one of the ends of instruction. When this is done, the pupils will feel more distinctly that their school life is the true and helpful road to their actual future, and they can go forward in it with a warmer moral enthusiasm.

It is also most important that civics, or the science of civil government, should be taught in our public schools. In this work we should begin with our normal schools, that we may have properly prepared teachers of civics. This instruction should then extend down to the high schools and other grades of our public schools. If need be, our state legislature should be petitioned to provide for instruction in civics, and also for moral instruction, in our public schools ; and industrial education should follow as soon as practicable. We can well afford to drop from our present courses of study in these schools much that is of but little practical value to make room for these new lines of instruction, which are indispensable to the welfare of our people and the preservation of our free institutions. Thanks to the American Institute of Civics, which was organized in 1887 by some of the most distinguished and patriotic citizens of our country, public attention is being drawn to this and kindred subjects by public addresses and pamphlets issued by the Institute.*

While confessing that our public school system needs amendment, we must stoutly resist the efforts of any church or organization of men to destroy or weaken it by a division of its funds for the support of church schools or for the support of schools founded upon differences of language among the newcomers from Europe. The editor of a prominent northern paper, in commenting upon the experience of Canada in distributing its school fund for the support of church schools, and the plea that the same thing should be done in this country, remarks :

In Canada dissatisfied parents are allowed, under certain restrictions, to divert the amount of their taxes to the support of denominational

* THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS is now the official organ of this organization.

schools. In practice the tendency is to build up sectarian schools everywhere and to emphasize religious prejudices from the very beginning of the child's life.

The insuperable objection to this plan is that it threatens the unity of the nation. The type of our national character is still being modified by the new elements in our heterogeneous population. It can only be unified through national control of primary education in schools where differences of home prejudice and customs are modified by the pressure of a common training, and where all stand upon a common footing as Americans. It is indeed the continuation of racial prejudice and misunderstanding which most threatens the unity of our people. It is the absence of a true national spirit, caused by the perpetuation of race prejudice and religious hate, which most retards the development of Canada, and has made the tone of thought in its provinces essentially provincial. If we are one people—as the Canadians have never been—it is largely because our children have been brought together in the common schools and have learned to respect and have faith in each other in spite of differences. The public school has made the unity of the nation possible, and this is a service which we can neither forget nor forego.

While there is no room in this country for a Knownothing party, we must restrict immigration from every quarter of the globe if we are to preserve our free institutions unimpaired. Neither can the American people afford to tolerate parties organized upon the basis of religious preferences or antipathies. We may well be proud of the good sense and patriotism of that foreign-born citizen (Mr. Schieren, the present mayor of Brooklyn) who recently refused permission to raise the flag of an alien people over the city hall of Brooklyn, saying that the American flag was good enough for anybody in this country, and that no other flag should float over the city hall of Brooklyn while he was its mayor. We may also justly be proud of the patriotic utterances of the Roman Catholic Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul, who, in a recent sermon on "Foreign Nationalism in America," said :

"Foreign nationalism in America must be kept in the background and made to give place in the church and street to Americanism. The Catholic Church, as far as she wears a national aspect, must be American in America. To make her Irish is to make her unfit for the country. Segregation of one body of Catholics from another on foreign lines is wrong. The

church has suffered from lack of Americanism ; one nationalism is and must be supreme in our civil and social matters, and that is American nationalism. On this condition has America admitted foreigners to citizenship. No political segregation of citizens on foreign lines can be allowed. No one should vote as an Irishman or seek office as an Irishman. It is wrong in private life to cultivate the spirit of a foreign nationalism at the expense of American nationalism. Nothing can be allowed that takes the slightest degree from the honor of her flag and allegiance to her laws. Citizens of foreign descent must know that only by being thorough Americans can they succeed even in material prospects and in the gaining of respect and confidence in this country."

We may well commend these wise and noble utterances to the many foreign-born priests and bishops of diverse nationalities belonging to that church in America, who seem most anxious to segregate their congregations from the mass of their fellow citizens on lines of race, language, and religion.

The making of a homogeneous and noble people out of this vast aggregation of heterogeneous elements composing our present population, and out of their descendants, is a work that will tax to the utmost the wisest statesmanship, the purest patriotism, and the most Christlike endeavor. It is the work of a century. With hearts uplifted by faith in God and aflame with love for country, we anxiously look down the long vista of the coming years to see what the American people of a century hence shall be. It will be a different people from any which dwell here to-day. Let us hope for the controlling influence on the future of the old American stock, which created and has maintained our free institutions, and through whose respect for divine law and love of liberty regulated by law, our past achievements have been possible.

IRA H. EVANS

STRIKES FROM AN ECONOMIC STANDPOINT.

BY REV. E. D. M'CREARY, PH.D.

THE current year has thus far been made specially notable by unusual and widespread disturbances in the departments of business and labor. Besides a number of strikes, which in ordinary times would have attracted marked attention and comment, two great strikes, unusual in magnitude, importance, and effects, have absorbed public attention and have widely and disastrously affected the business interests of the country. The first was inaugurated by the coal operatives, and, by the stoppage of the fuel supply, seriously, for a season, crippled our manufacturing interests. The second, brought about by the American Railway Union under the autocratic leadership of President Debs, followed closely after the coal miner strike, is still in progress at this writing, and has had a disastrous effect, from a financial standpoint, on the railroad systems—especially of the middle and far west, and also on the general business interests of the country at large.

The frequency with which strikes occur in this and other countries is indicative of the fact that either the true relations of capital and labor are greatly misapprehended both by employers and employees, or that grave defects exist in the manner in which the various departments of labor are conducted. The causes of strikes are often ascribed in a general and indefinite way to antagonism existing between capital and labor. But the interests of capital and labor, when properly understood, are one and the same, each being dependent on the other for profitable employment, so that whatever is inimical to one is hurtful to the other. If labor is withdrawn from the market, capital cannot find profitable employment; if capital is withdrawn or destroyed, business becomes paralyzed, avenues of labor are

closed, wages are diminished or entirely cease, and the working classes are compelled to live in enforced idleness, which is always accompanied with great privation and suffering. It must be evident from these facts that capital and labor are allies and not enemies, and that whatever interrupts their amicable relations must prove hurtful to both.

Strikes have been aptly styled "the insurrection of labor." The right of insurrection against oppressive measures, or those that encroach on the rights and liberties of the individual, cannot be denied; but insurrection of any kind should be the last resort for obtaining redress for either real or fancied grievances. All other means of securing relief should first be tried before insurrectionary methods are resorted to. For insurrections are always destructive in their nature and tendency, and are prolific sources of loss and waste. Strikes, being insurrectionary in their nature, are no exception to this rule. On their inception, production in the department in which the strike occurs at once ceases; capacity to labor becomes valueless; capital becomes profitless; and local and sometimes general derangement of business occurs, affecting adversely not only the business in which the strikers themselves are engaged, but many other departments of business as well. In fact even an extensive strike that has ever occurred has been productive of great loss to both capital and labor.

Seventeen years ago (July 14) the great railroad strike of 1877 began on the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. While the center of that memorable strike was at Pittsburg, Pa., the effect of disturbance spread over the entire country, from New York to San Francisco. Between 6,000 and 7,000 miles of road were at one time or another in the hands of the strikers; at St. Louis, Chicago, and Indianapolis, as well as at eastern cities there was a complete embargo on the railroads. Traffic and travel ceased for the time being over a large section of the country, and to name the companies "tied up" would require much space in this article. Although it passed over the country with the suddenness of a tornado, it was productive of almost incalculable loss. Between eight and ten million dol-

worth of railroad property was destroyed outright; while the loss to the strikers in wages, and to the companies in time and money, and to business in general, amounted at least to as many millions more, and the cost to the states for the services of militia, extra police force, and other expenses coincident with the strike, added still more millions to the sum total of the cost of that expensive disturbance.

A decade or more ago an extensive strike was inaugurated by the iron-workers of Pennsylvania and Ohio. It was estimated that not less than 100,000 men were thrown out of employment by it, either directly or indirectly. The average wages of these various classes of laborers would at that time average at least \$2.50 per day. The strike lasted for several weeks, and each week the loss to labor alone footed up the enormous aggregate of \$1,500,000. The loss to the various businesses affected by it was also proportionately great.

During the year 1887 there were 872 strikes, in which 345,073 strikers participated, involving a loss of 10,253,921 days' labor in the aggregate. During 1888 there were 679 strikes, involving 211,016 strikers and causing a loss of 7,562,480 days' labor. Thus, during these two years alone, strikes resulted in a loss of 17,816,401 days of labor to the working classes, which, rated at the average of \$2.00 per day per man for wages, makes an aggregate loss of \$35,632,802 to wage-earners alone. This huge amount denotes an absolute and irreparable loss to the working classes, inasmuch as labor is the most perishable of all commodities. Most other commodities may be stored up for a longer or shorter time without incurring loss either in quantity or quality, but labor will not keep. Unless sold each day, that portion of it can never be sold at all. It is evident that to-day's labor cannot be sold or utilized after to-day, for to-morrow it will have ceased to exist. Hence, a laborer cannot, for however short a time, in working hours, postpone the sale of his labor without forever losing the price of labor which he might have performed during the period of postponement.

It may be urged in reply that the loss incurred during these industrial insurrections is more than compensated for by the

increased price which the worker receives for his labor as a result of a successful strike. But statistics show conclusively that not more than one half of the many strikes that occur are successful, and that even when successful they seldom result in an increase in the price of labor for a great length of time. But even when strikers are successful in bringing their employers to terms, if the strike has been of extended duration, much time—even years—must elapse before the increased rates of wages can compensate for the loss of time spent in idleness. It has been found by careful computation that when an addition of five per cent to existing wages is the matter in dispute, the loss of one month's wages will require one and three fifths years of labor at the advanced rates to make up the deficiency; two months of idleness will require three and one fifth years; six months of idleness, nine and three fifths years of continuous employment at the advanced figures to make up the amount of wages lost.

Computations such as these are not put forward to prove that strikes cannot be of any advantage to the working classes; but they do demonstrate conclusively that strikes, like all other insurrections, are costly and destructive, and that from an economic standpoint they are usually productive of much greater loss than gain. These facts are known and conceded by the leaders of labor unions, and yet they are often forced by the pressure brought to bear upon them by discontented, hot-headed members of their associations to "call on" a strike when such action is contrary to their better judgment. Mr. Powderly is reported to have said in a recent conversation that during all the years he occupied the position of Master Workman of the Knights of Labor he never willingly issued an order to strike, but that he was constrained to do so at times by pressure brought to bear upon him by members of that order.

It cannot be denied that circumstances sometimes arise which render strikes not only admissible but, at times, imperatively necessary in order to preserve the rights of laborers from the encroachments of employers. When strikes are undertaken for such a purpose they are to be commended rather than depre-

although from an economic standpoint they are pretty
to entail a heavy financial loss on all parties concerned.
In such cases the loss of time and money is more than com-
pensated for by the gain in independence and power by the
working classes.

One of the most frequent causes of strikes arises from the
fact that employers are usually possessed of large amounts of
capital, and the employees seem to think that a large amount of
capital in the hands of their employers ought to insure them
against low wages. In this respect employees overlook two funda-
mental economic facts, the first of which is that the employ-
ment of a large number of men requires a correspondingly
large capital, since in most kinds of business an investment, on
an average, of \$1,000 in buildings, machinery, etc., is re-
quired for each workman employed. Hence the greater the
number of men employed the greater is the expense incurred
in the capital required. The second fact is that wages cannot
be paid out of capital, but must come out of the profits of pro-
duction. Neither can employers pay out as wages the whole
of the profits arising from production, since to conduct any
business successfully the profits of production must not only
cover the wages of those employed, but must also be sufficient to
pay for necessary repairs in buildings and machinery, pay all
other expenses incurred by the business, return a fair
interest on capital invested, and also remunerate the employer
for his time and risk, the latter of which, in every large busi-
ness, is at times very great.

On the other hand, the refusal of employers and corporations
to make an equitable division of the profits of industry with
the employees is gross injustice, and is mainly answerable for
the feeling of antagonism which often exists between
workers and their employers, and constitutes one of the most
important sources of strikes. For a laborer to see his employer
living in luxury and dwelling in a palatial mansion, possessed
of everything that heart can wish, while he is compelled to
live with his family in the topmost story of a tumbledown tenement,
and to see the rapacious demands of a selfish, grasping land-

lord, and by his best exertions is only barely able to keep the wolf from the door—is a sight that inspires no very pleasant reflections; and especially so when he has good reason to think that many of his employer's luxuries are purchased with money which justly and of right belongs to him and his fellow-workmen. The general introduction into all kinds of business of the profit-sharing system that has been found to work so well wherever adopted, would do much to allay the present discontent among the working classes, and would form a strong economic bond of union between employers and employees. It is safe to say that a strike has never occurred, neither has any serious disturbance arisen between employers and employees, where such a system has been adopted and faithfully and efficiently carried out by all parties concerned.

It remains still to consider briefly another economic result accruing from strikes which the working classes do not take into consideration, and that is the frequency of strikes and boycotts, and the extremes to which they are being carried will make men of wealth chary about investing their means in enterprises which employ labor. Capitalists are not compelled to run manufacturing plants, operate mines, build and maintain railroads, and if they find that the business enterprises in which their capital is employed is to be subjected to the whims and caprices of labor agitators year after year, and often made unproductive, they will choose some other form of investment. The result will be that few, if, indeed, any new business or manufacturing enterprises will be undertaken, and, as a consequence of that fact, men who depend upon employment for a living will be unable to get work at any price. Thus by killing the hen that laid the golden egg, so to speak, labor will become the victim of its own folly—for if labor in any way causes capital to become unproductive, capital must necessarily cease to employ labor. The *London Times*, viewing the American Railway Union strike from this standpoint, said in a recent editorial that "Debs and his coadjutors have done as much to harm the industries of America in a week as the Confederate armies did in months." This statement, unfortunately, is only

ruer. Whenever leading industries are rendered unproductive by strikes or violence, investments in enterprises that require the employment of large bodies of workingmen will be retarded, and thus possible avenues to employment will be closed, and willing hands cannot find work to do.

Hence, it is evidently to the interest of workingmen that capital should be encouraged in every possible way to embark in investments that will furnish employment for labor, so that employment may become so plentiful that all who desire to work may be able to obtain constant and remunerative employment. If, however, capitalists are made to feel that they cannot trust those whom they must necessarily employ in their industrial enterprises, and that the productiveness, or even the very existence, of the capital which may be invested in such enterprises will be constantly endangered by strikes and deeds of violence, it is evident that they will hold aloof from such undertakings, and will prefer even to let their capital remain in idleness in a safe place of deposit, rather than risk the loss almost surely incurred by such investments.

Thus the strike is already becoming an economic boomerang to the unskilled hands of labor organizations, and instead of protecting the capitalist, it is "knocking out" the parties who are seeking to use it as a weapon for their own protection. From an economic standpoint, it is evident that strikes must be pronounced a failure.

E. D. McCREARY.

THE CONDITION AND PROSPECTS OF THE AMERICAN FARMER.

BY CHARLES E. BENTON.

THOSE of us whose age permits the memory to run back freely and gather in its grasp the events of the past third of a century have opportunity to ponder deeply, and wonderingly perhaps, in tracing first from effect back to cause, thence retracing the steps and by a synthetic process of reasoning account, if possible, for the present actual condition of the farmers as a class, and of farming as a business.

Let us first see what that condition is. The importance of such consideration will be readily understood when it is known that more persons are engaged in agriculture in the United States than are engaged in any other occupation, and if farm laborers had not for the most part been entered in the census returns simply as "laborers" it is probable that more persons would be shown to be engaged in agriculture than in all other employments combined. Despite the fact that the government has literally given away all the land thus far disposed of (the nominal price charged does not quite pay the government's expense of surveys, land office, etc.), yet in the last census now before us we are confronted by the unpleasant fact that the proportion of mortgaged farms is steadily increasing, and this does not take account of the second and third mortgages that have been placed on farms already encumbered.

The further fact is also made manifest that the farms are rapidly passing into the possession of the landlords; meaning by the term, those who rent the land to others, but who do not use it themselves. To apply an expressive rural phrase, the farms are being "dropped."

I gather the following summary from a well-known writer on

statistics: "In 1860 the farmers of the United States owned about one half of the wealth of the nation. In 1870 they owned a little over one third of the wealth. In 1880 they owned a little more than one fourth. In 1890 they owned less than one fifth." A careful analysis of statistics shows further that the individual gains of those engaged in agriculture were greatest in the period between 1840 and 1860; and notwithstanding the accelerated haste with which the government continued to dispose of the public domain, the average during that time was more than twice as much as it has been in any decade since the latter date.

These and other statistics relating to farm values are of necessity based somewhat, in the first instance, upon the assessment rolls of towns and counties; but it is a notorious fact that on this point the records of tax assessments cannot be implicitly relied on, for the concentration of political influence in metropolitical circles has had the constant tendency of checking the raising of valuations on city and village land, and at the same time of checking the lowering of valuations on farm land, so that the changes shown in these tables are but a portion of the actual change that has been going on during the last three decades. Those who are in a position to know agree that while city and village land has increased in value with a rapidity never before dreamed of, yet during the same period farm lands have depreciated on an average at least one third.

The writer was born and grew to manhood on a farm in New York which was at that time (before the war) in one of the most prosperous agricultural sections of the country. The condition of affairs at that time was that nearly all the farms in the town were owned by men who had made their property by farming. Many began life by going in debt for their farms, and after paying for them had laid up money besides. The present condition in that town is this: With a wide acquaintance there and with diligent inquiry of residents, not a single instance has been found of a person under fifty years of age possessing any property which he has acquired by farming.

In an adjoining town which has a little over six hundred

voters the records show that in the ten years preceding 1890 there were two hundred and fifty new mortgages placed upon real estate, most of them upon farms. One of the state assessors of New York has given it as his opinion that "in a few decades there will be few or none but tenant farmers in the state."

Let us take an instance from another state. A report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for Illinois in reference to farm mortgages gives this summary of this indebtedness at the following periods, viz., in 1870, 1880, and 1887. By leaving out town and city lots and the suburban district of Chicago, the purely agricultural part of this debt is seen, and it is given as follows:

YEAR.	DEBT.
1870.....	\$ 95,721,003
1880.....	103,525,237
1887.....	123,733,098

As this report separates, with such accuracy as it can command, "mortgages representing deferred payments of purchase money from loans," the report tells its own story and justifies the deduction of the commissioners that "the mortgage indebtedness of farmers has increased twenty-three per cent from 1880 to 1887," and doubtless the debts are still piling up in a similar ratio. This is an unwelcome showing for a state that is comparatively new and which comprises one of the finest agricultural sections of the world, and this during a time when the political orators, from the president down, were congratulating their audiences upon the fact that "the American people were increasing in wealth faster than any other people in the world; an increase estimated at more than \$6,000,000 a day." Would it not be appropriate to ask at this juncture, who are the "American people"? These are but isolated instances, you say. They can be paralleled in every state and nearly every county in the Union. Says the editor of the *Christian Register*, commenting upon the situation: "A western paper before us contains forty-nine columns of mortgage foreclosure sales."

These facts, and many others that might be adduced, show that the condition of the average American farmers to-day is not one on which they may appropriately be congratulated. On the contrary, their farms are being swept by the thousand

into the realm of landlordism, whose growing giant, Want, even the Horn of Plenty cannot satisfy ; while of those who still retain possession and nominal ownership a large number are practically made tenant farmers by means of debt. In short, the condition of the American farmer is rapidly verging toward that of the Irish farmer, of whom John Stuart Mill said, "he cannot be better or worse off by any act of his. If industrious or prudent, nobody but the landlord gains; if lazy or intemperate, it is at the landlord's expense."

Here are plain statements in regard to facts which cannot be refuted, and as it is too late in the world's history to assume that anything has happened without adequate cause, it behooves us in this instance to look for the causes that have led to such results, and as the results are national in their extent it will be found that the causes have to do with politico-national economy.

The first and most obvious object for study is the tariff, which has been increasingly protective in its character during the three decades of the most marked depression in agriculture. It is not within the scope of this article to attempt to refute all the arguments advanced in favor of protection. They are contradictory, and if followed out logically will refute each other. This was well illustrated in a couple of pamphlets received by the writer not long since. They were both issued by the same state Republican committee and were evidently intended to catch the farm votes. The first made the most positive assertion, backed by a long argument, that a protective tariff always and under all circumstances resulted in lowering the price of the article protected. The second pamphlet was equally emphatic in asserting that a tariff on tobacco had always resulted in increasing the price of that article, sometimes more than doubling it, and proved it by a table of market prices covering a long series of years. This is a fair sample of protection argument and suggests that the safest way to eventually meet the issue would be to endow a professorship of logic and common sense in the public schools.

By way of illustrating the position of the farmer, let us sup-

pose that orators and editors had vied with each other in praising the iron manufacturer, had called him the "mainstay and sinew of the country," and so on *ad infinitum*.

Now, suppose that while the iron manufacturer was being thus metaphorically patted on the back, the government was inviting the iron men of all the world to come, offering to present each with a mine and embark him in the iron industry to place his products on an already overloaded market. Would the iron manufacturers have deemed that under such circumstances they were being "properly encouraged"? Yet this is what has been accorded to farmers. In the production of the principal staples they have been left in competition with the world in selling, and have been shut out from that competition in purchasing. ✓

Potent as have been these influences in depressing agriculture—and their importance can hardly be overestimated—there is another of still greater magnitude, so obscure that until lately it has escaped public attention, and yet so obvious that when once seen, like the historic cat, it fills the whole picture. Not only is the farmer subjected to competition with men who have had presented to them free the finest land in the world, stocked with the accumulated fertility of ages which may be drawn upon like a bank deposit, but his competitors are men to whom the price of produce is a secondary consideration. They do not look to that for their gain, but to that rise in land values which is expected from the increased demand for land caused by the moving tide of migration. It must not be supposed that any one can make wages, or even half wages, by raising ten cent corn or forty cent wheat. I notice that a recent estimate of the Dakota wheat crop of 1893 gives the average yield as twelve bushels per acre, much of which was drawn several miles to an elevator and sold for about forty cents a bushel, thus making an average return of \$4.80 per acre for interest on capital and reward of labor. An intelligent Dakota farmer of some experience informs the writer that with the best modern machinery wheat cannot be raised, harvested, and threshed for less than a cost of \$8.00 per acre. Yet the season of 1894 sees a larger average of Dakota wheat planted than ever before.

The city laborers have the laws arranged to shut out those who would compete with them on equal terms, and the manufacturer is also protected from competition, but their neighbor on the farm is subjected to competition from men who are willing to work for half wages, quarter wages, or no wages at all for that matter, so long as they can maintain life in the body and cling to the land, trusting for a rise in land values that will recoup them for losses sustained in flooding the markets with cheap produce. When, finally, the wave of humanity with its demand for land does come, a large proportion of them have, under the pressure of debt incurred by farming at a loss, "dropped" their farms, or being so encumbered that life has become a hopeless struggle with debt are ready to succumb to the slough of depression always following the first rise in frontier prices.

[Nor is the evil confined to the western states. The farmers of the middle and eastern states, finding the towns glutted with produce forced on the market at far less than cost, are driven to a desperate competition with each other in the by-ways of farming. Even in the local markets they are losing ground step by step. The fresh meat market is wrested from their grasp by companies who pasture their cattle on government land. Then hay, sold by the prairie farmer at starvation prices, displaces the home-grown product, and other things follow in like manner until now the eastern farmer is almost entirely dependent upon the perishable products of market gardening and the dairy.] How long he may hold his own in these is a question. The latter seems already to be passing under the control of the west. The effect of this competition was well expressed by a Connecticut farmer who said to the writer: "When anybody buys anything of me he seems to think he has done me a favor, and that I ought to thank him for it." The "abandoned New England farms," upon which so much comment has been made in the papers during the last few years, are fully accounted for in the causes and conditions that I have attempted to outline briefly.

[It is said that western farmers are being ruined by their greed

for more land, but this is not true. That which is working the ruin of farmers both east and west is the speculators' greed for the *unearned increment*—the effort to own and cling to more land than can be used profitably, expecting to gain the increased value which comes from an increased demand. This it is which is flooding the market with produce anxious to find a purchaser, at less than cost if need be, and is thus the means of crowding the books of real estate agents with descriptions of farms for sale; it is burdening the western papers with foreclosure notices; it has caused the creation of vast corporations whose sole business it is to peddle farm mortgages as an investment for the accumulated wealth of manufacturing towns, their siphon lines extending in a network over the whole country; it has presented the anomalous spectacle of food begging for a market side by side with idle workmen begging for food.]

What then is to be the outcome? The frontier is nearly gone, will not the matter right itself? As a denser population will make a larger demand for both the land and the products, will not prices rise and the business again become profitable? Doubtless in the near future there will be a greater demand for, and consequent higher value of land. But we must consider that the proportion of farms worked by tenants is rapidly increasing, being thirty-two per cent of the whole number in 1890, and that of those who nominally own their farms, thirty-one per cent are practically made tenants by mortgage indebtedness which also shows a marvelously rapid increase.

At the time of writing this the census returns of twenty-two states and territories have been tabulated and they show the following startling summary: From 1880 to 1890, with an increase in population of twenty-five per cent and an increase in national wealth of fifty per cent, the number of farmers who own their farms has increased less than one per cent, while the number of farms worked by tenants has increased forty-nine per cent, and the incurred real estate mortgage indebtedness has increased one hundred fifty-six per cent.

In the light of these figures we may be reasonably sure that when such time does arrive it will find most of the choice land

held by those who will not use it themselves, but will exact a rent from the real producers who do use it. A few of the well-to-do may continue to own their inherited farms, and become landlords in a small way themselves, but history shows that under present conditions the tendency will be, as time goes on, for the ownership of land to concentrate in the hands of the very wealthy, who will have their agents and rent rolls in truly English style. Indeed few are aware how firmly the institution of landlordism is already planted here, particularly in our western states, where many thousand acres are sometimes held in the name—and often it is a foreign name—of a single person, who perhaps has never seen it save when, accompanied by a party of friends with servants and dogs, he has hunted over it. Vast areas are also owned and controlled by syndicates, both foreign and American.

Farming is the one business in this world which seems nearest to man's primal nature, and without which no other employment could exist. To the vivifying influences of this contact with mother earth in man's natural employment we are indebted for that constant regeneration of buoyant life and hope which constitutes the safety of the republic. The nation which attempts to rear its structure of prosperity without a sure foundation in agriculture will be likely to meet the fate of the man who builded his house upon the sand. The farming fraternity of America is of a stanch stock, descended from the best classes of the mother countries, and under better influences from this stock has sprung our choicest blood. Hosts of valiant men and women, grown up under the benign influences and in loving sympathy with nature on farms, have gone forth with stout hearts to do deeds that have made the nation respected at home and abroad. Those who have kept themselves informed in matters pertaining thereto during the last thirty or more years, and during that time have watched the current of events cannot but have the gravest apprehensions for the future of American agriculture. It has now come to the parting of the ways. If it continue in the path thus far followed, what that future will be needs no seer to foretell—the American farmer of

the next generation will be the counterpart of the Irish farmer; he will be a tenant farmer drudging for an existence, while landlords, living upon the earnings of his toil, will saunter to and fro in the world at will. The present generation has it in its power to place agriculture, once for all, in the right path and rescue this noblest occupation of man from such adverse fate. This may be done by what is known as the single tax. This would be a tax on the value of land, considered as separate from all improvements, and would abolish all other taxes, whether upon personal property or improvements upon real estate.

By this means the increased value which attaches to land by reason of increased population would be taken in the form of taxes. This would be just because there are values which are created by the public, and when taken as taxes would be expended for the public benefit.

Speculation in land would cease because the mere holding of land would not be profitable. Only those who put land to its best uses would find it profitable to own it; hence landlordism would disappear, and farms would be owned by the farmers themselves, while better conditions, both social and industrial, would be encouraged because improvements would not be taxed.

The legitimate farmer would no longer be crowded out by produce dumped on the market by men who are not farming for profit, but are farming to keep alive *while they speculate in land for a profit*.

With the disappearance of the land speculator the natural action of the laws of supply and demand would insure remunerative prices, and agriculture would again offer an encouraging field for the employment of labor and capital, and would once more take its place on an equal footing with other industries. Its laborers would receive as good pay as other laborers, and capital, backed by executive and financiering ability, win reward there as in the other walks of life; the farmhouse with its benign influences would again become the healthful center from which would radiate as before the life and hope of the republic.

CHARLES E. BENTON.

THE FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT.

BY ALBERT E. DENSLOW.

WHAT are the functions of government? How far should the government interfere with the actions of its citizens? These questions would have been superfluous two hundred years ago, but at the present time they are the subject of much discussion. Herbert Spencer and his school of thought hold that it is the essential duty of government to *protect*; which means substantially to maintain the peace and administer justice. And more recently Professor Sumner has declared in words that cannot be misunderstood that "the supreme result of modern society is to guarantee to every man the use of all his powers exclusively for his own benefit."

Unquestionably it is a primary duty of government to maintain the peace. The orderly members of society must have ample protection against the attacks of the disorderly, else all would be chaos. And of course of equal importance is the administration of justice to all. Under any form of government this cannot be "absolute." Yet it is indispensable that there should be ample justice relatively administered. Men must have abundant security in their rights to property, otherwise the ambition, the incentive to gain, and to improve one's condition generally, would be destroyed; and with this incentive destroyed, the progress of the world would be wonderfully retarded. But the logic of all this is, that every assumption of authority by the government other than solely to *protect*, is detrimental to the best interests of society. Right here is our separating point. I think it is the duty of government to interfere with the actions of the people further than this. I contend that the necessities of the great mass of the people at the present day make the further extension of the functions of gov-

ernment imperative. Indeed, all the conditions under which we now live bespeak this necessity.

On the banner of a float of young girls in the last labor day procession in the city of Boston, was this inscription, "You cannot expect us to be angels on three dollars per week." In normal times a half million of men are out of work all of the time, while another million can barely earn enough to live upon from day to day. Already it is estimated that nine per cent of the families of the United States own seventy-one per cent of the wealth. Surely poverty, want, and misery are all about us. Grave social problems are confronting us, all must admit. But the devotee of *laissez faire* tells us, "The only solution is in the application of the law of the survival of the fittest." Which means if that poor man with blackened face and stooping shoulders, just going home after a hard day's work at the foundry, for which he received one dollar and a half, has not the strength to hold on to this swiftly moving industrial train he must drop and perish by the way. Possibly if all the weak and dependent should be destroyed, the material wealth of the nation would be increased. But this would only be temporary. For with a continuation of the competitive system there would soon be another crop of weak and dependent to slouch off in the same manner. Surely this is purchasing progress at a fearful cost.

But this will not do. We cannot afford to smother Christianity in this way. The example of the Good Samaritan would be much more profitable for us to follow. If I mistake not, the fine old doctrine of *laissez faire* will not do for this day and generation. The state has much higher and more noble functions to perform than those intrusted to a policeman. If the present industrial system is to long continue, the functions of government must be considerably extended,—else the number of unfortunates that will perish by the way in the fierce strife for existence will continue to increase at an unprecedented rate. Some day we will come to our senses and find out that we cannot deal with men as though they were bales of cotton or lumps of iron. We must remember that they are human beings, possessed of

more or less sympathy and love. If we are to make lasting progress, we must first discard this heartless and unsocial doctrine, which teaches that all men are to seek first the gratification of self—until the cup runneth over. But in all efforts to rectify existing wrongs, the state must not interfere to a degree that will deprive a man irrelatively of what he has justly earned by his own efforts.

Now I do not believe the government should control all the interests of society. But its functions can be extended, and its power vigorously used with perfect safety to promote the general welfare. First of all is the advancement of education. It already is an established policy in this country to furnish a certain amount of education, although in some of our states children by the thousand are allowed to grow up in ignorance. A friend of mine while visiting recently in another state had occasion to go through a factory where a large number of children were employed, and on inquiring when they went to school was told that they did not go at all. This is certainly an unmerciful wrong. It is a condition of affairs which calls for prompt and radical treatment. But again, there is a poor boy in a tenement house in New York City, growing up into manhood in abject poverty and ignorance. The Creator has endowed him with capacities and faculties, but I ask in all seriousness, how is this boy going to develop these endowments, if it is the sole duty of government to act as a *protector*? To be sure he may be discovered by some noble philanthropist, or have some other opportunity later on in life, but this is all perchance. There should be no escape for this boy from attending school until he is seventeen years of age. If parents fail to send the child to school because of indifference, they should be compelled to do so. But if they fail to send him because they are too poor, then the state should assume the responsibility. Parents have a right to govern their own child, but this right is subordinate to the rights and duties of government. It is for the common good that the state insist upon all its youth receiving a liberal education.

The time is near at hand when the power of the government

must be enlisted to suppress the liquor traffic. Allowed to prey upon the weaknesses of humanity, it has become a gigantic and atrocious monopoly. Everywhere legislators crouch before its powerful influence. It is a well-organized and malignant force constantly at work poisoning the life blood of the nation. The state has long recognized the liquor traffic as an evil, but instead of trying to suppress the evil, it makes a hypocritical attempt to regulate it. For a specified sum the state grants a man the privilege of establishing himself in the liquor business. He may carry it on in the back room of a grocery, or in a magnificent saloon before gilded mirrors and under the glare of electric lights. In either place he may sell liquor to men until their brains are crazed. Yes, the state gives him leave to carry on this nefarious business—that steals wages, degrades manhood, weakens productive force, increases the poverty and wretchedness of the whole people, and destroys the souls of men. Think of it! The state, the Christian state, gives man a license to do these things and then turns squarely around and says to the poor laboring man substantially this: "If you do go into one of these licensed saloons, spend your hard earned wages, become intoxicated, and then go out on the street, you will at once be arrested and taken to the lockup. Then after you have become sober you will be taken before a judge and fined or sent to jail, or possibly both."

Surely such legislation is not only farcical, but it is disgraceful as well. Let us welcome the day when, with the same alertness, the state will exercise its power to prevent drunkenness that it now does to punish drunkards. When that day comes, we shall have inaugurated a reform that will do much toward drying up instead of damming up this river of contamination.

One of the most serious and perplexing questions confronting the nation to-day is that of monopolies and trusts. It is right here in our own country that the most marvelous growth of monopolies of all kinds has taken place. Undoubtedly this to some extent is due to the great amount of legislation especially enacted to create and stimulate their growth. A complete story of the manipulations of courts and legislatures and all the other

tyrannical and corrupting methods practiced by great corporations in their efforts to crush all competition, would furnish a chapter in our history that could hardly fail to make all true patriots blush for shame. Extensive concentration of capital may be necessary for the carrying forward of great industrial enterprises; but the power which accompanies such vast concentration tends like all power to become selfish and oppressive. This power must not be left to go unchecked. The government needs to continually watch and restrain it.

The railroads, the telegraph and telephone, and the express business are all, like the post-office, quasi-public corporations. They exist by the consent and encouragement of government. They are by nature monopolistic. They are not subject to the forces of competition like an ordinary manufacturing corporation. The business which they do emanates from the necessities of the people, therefore is of general public interest. Already we hear "the proposition of certain managers to combine all the trunk lines of railway and operate the many divided systems under the management of one great corporation." This is no silly dream; it is among the possibilities of the near future and when we approach a little nearer that day, we shall be face to face with the question: Shall the railroads control the government or the government control the railroads? The company directing such a great enterprise as this, would have an income much larger than the United States government, and of course constantly increasing. It would employ a force of men something like 780,000. The influence which such a great corporation as this would have upon all legislation affecting its interests is incalculable.

These simple facts alone are sufficient reason for the prevalent widespread and bitter feeling against these powerful combinations. They also show the necessity of a prompt solution of the whole problem. Some way must be found to check the growth and restrain the power of these bold and greedy monopolies. To accomplish this, I am led to believe all virtual monopolies must eventually be owned or controlled by the state. The lighting, the water works, the street-car service of a city are also

quasi-public corporations. They exercise public franchises. They too are monopolistic. A city could not allow its streets to be torn up and tracked by a number of railway companies. When a city gives one corporation the right of occupation of streets, it practically insures that corporation a monopoly of the business. It gives a public franchise which is to be used for the benefit of private parties. Now these corporations exist by the consent of the municipalities, consequently it is the right and duty of the municipalities to keep a careful watch over them, and when expedient own or control the plants.

Of the many bold and shameful industrial monopolies which are plundering the people at the present day, the sugar trust may be cited as a fair representation of the character and intent of them all. This giant has pursued the policy of swallowing up all competitors until, at the present time, effective competition is simply out of the question. It has increased its capital stock to \$75,000,000, which amount it is generally thought represents property costing and worth about one-third that sum. Yet on this immensely inflated capitalization, the trust was able last year to pay the seven per cent dividend guaranteed on the \$37,500,000 of preferred stock and twelve per cent on the common of the same amount, and then it divided up ten per cent additional on the common in an extra dividend from accumulated surplus. It is also generally thought that the trust has a large surplus left after making these very generous distributions of profits. There is not a shadow of doubt but what this trust wrenches from the people to-day enough to pay an annual dividend of over forty per cent on the actual investment. And when an attempt is made by the people's representatives to remove all protection which the tariff affords this monopoly, the news at once comes from Washington that a powerful and unscrupulous lobby has invaded the capitol. These lobbyists work every possible point to "influence" senators not to remove the tariff from manufactured sugar. They tell the finance committee the tariff is necessary to protect the poor laboring man. Such an assertion is simply blasphemous. Let us not be deceived. The representatives of this or any other great trust

do not go to Washington to lobby for the laboring man. They go there to see to it that the laws which have helped build up and will naturally further protect them shall not be repealed. Most certainly it is about time some check was put upon these plunderers of the people, and for government to longer tariff-tax the people, to foster the growth of these greedy monopolies, is well nigh a criminal wrong.

I am also enough of a socialist to believe it is the plain duty of government to act as arbitrator in the many strifes between employers and employed. To illustrate the necessity of such a course, let us look at the situation as it exists to-day. Here is a great corporation with a capital running up into the millions, and employing several thousand men. It is a well-known fact that for many months trouble has been brewing in this establishment. Several attempts have been made to settle the differences satisfactorily, but all have proved futile. Finally the long contemplated reduction in wages is announced. The men are fierce in their denunciation of this course. They think a great wrong has been done them. They go out on a strike. As a consequence, for a time at least, the works are closed and production is stopped. And what adds greater gravity to the situation, several thousand men are walking the streets in idleness. The sense of wrong coupled with the pangs of hunger drives many of them on to violence, and a riot in the streets of the city is the spectacle. Thousands of dollars' worth of property is destroyed and much blood shed. Thus we have organized capital on the one side and organized labor on the other side, engaged in a terrible strife. Both are mad and determined to fight to the bitter end. It is actual war. Surely this is a deplorable state of affairs. But the state! At last it comes to the rescue. The military is called out to maintain the peace and protect men in their rights to property. While it is the duty of government to suppress rioting mobs, it also has a higher duty, that of preventing them. It ought to have acted before blood had been shed and property destroyed.

Again let us consider. According to the National Labor Bureau, there were from 1881 to 1886, 3,902 strikes involving

22,304 establishments. The number of employees striking and implicated is recorded as 1,323,203. There were during the same period 2,214 lockouts with 160,823 employees locked out. The same authority estimates the loss to the workmen during this period to be about \$60,000,000, and to the employers about \$35,000,000, making a grand total loss for six years of \$95,000,000. This is not only a very serious pecuniary loss to industry, but such strifes represent a moral injury to society far more destructive. There is an important fact in labor disputes which is too often overlooked, the fact that the interests at stake are not merely those of the workmen and employers, but are also those of society. A dispute between a corporation and a thousand or more employees is a situation which warrants the intervention of the state. It is the state's duty to bring these adversaries together that they may settle their differences by reason and not by force. Some method of arbitration should be adopted to prevent as well as settle these labor disputes. This will not of course furnish a panacea for all the ills of labor, but a general resort to arbitration "would mean a reign of law, rather than of force, and would mark an era in the moral evolution of society."

Now let us turn for a moment only to the white slaves of the "sweat-shops" in the miserable tenement houses of our large cities. Here we shall find women sewing as many as seventeen hours a day for the paltry sum of sixty cents. Women making "cheap overcoats at four cents apiece and boys' knee pants at sixteen cents a dozen pairs." A brief quotation from Mrs. Valesh, who has recently visited over fifty of these so-called sweat-shops in New York, will show the terrible condition of these workers: "In the attic of a gloomy building at 10½ Ludlow Street, six girls and thirteen men worked in a room twenty by twenty-five and seven and one half feet high. These people lived and cooked in a separate room. But with nineteen sewing machines in this room and bundles of clothing heaped on the floor, it was so crowded that one worker couldn't stir without disturbing others. The low ceiling and utter lack of ventilation made the air so thick and murky

that one could hardly distinguish the faces of the workers.”

Is it right for this generation to poison the blood of the next in this manner? Surely all will say no. How then is this terrible state of affairs to be corrected? The poor wretches who inhabit these places are helpless. The contractors and landlords who are profiting by it will of course do nothing. Such dens are a menace to the public health, an impediment to advancing civilization. The rights of private property are secondary in the presence of such conditions as these. The very existence of such vile conditions is sufficient reason for government to interfere. A Christian government should wipe out of existence these human-being slaughter houses. The functions of government can wisely and safely, and will soon, embrace many other subjects not touched upon in this article, but lack of space prevents a further discussion of them at the present time.

ALBERT E. DENSLOW.

FEDERAL INTERVENTION.

BY W. W. QUATERMASS.

THE right and power of the general government to send federal troops within the boundaries of a state to quell riots and suppress insurrections, when the state authorities have not asked for such troops, and have even protested against the sending of them, have recently been questioned. It has been asserted that the president of the United States has no authority to order troops within a state, except when requested by the proper state officials, according to Section IV. of Article IV. of the Federal Constitution, which reads :

The United States shall guarantee to every state of this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion ; *and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.*

On the other hand, it is insisted that this very clause indicates that the federal government may act even without the application of the state authorities, for it is therein made the positive duty of the federal government to protect each state "against invasion." State application for federal intervention is a condition precedent in cases of "domestic violence" only. When such violence affects the governmental functions of the state only, and the national government is not interfered with, it is conceded by all that the national government is powerless to act unless the legislature or the executive of the state makes application for aid.

Section 5298 of the revised statutes of the United States provides :

Whenever, by reason of unlawful obstructions, combinations, or assemblages of persons, or rebellion against the authority of the government of the United States, it shall become impracticable, in the judgment of the president, to enforce, by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, the laws of the United States within any state or terri-

tory, it shall be lawful for the president to call forth the militia of any or all of the states, and to employ such parts of the land and naval forces of the United States as he may deem necessary to enforce the faithful execution of the laws of the United States, or to suppress such rebellion, in whatever state or territory thereof the laws of the United States may be forcibly opposed, or the execution thereof forcibly obstructed.

Section 5299 further provides :

Whenever insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combinations, or conspiracies in any state so obstructs or hinders the execution of the laws thereof, and of the United States, as to deprive any portion or class of the people of such state of any of the rights, privileges, or immunities, or protection, named in the Constitution and secured by the laws for the protection of such rights, privileges, or immunities, and the constituted authorities of such state are unable to protect, or, from any cause, fail in or refuse protection of the people in such rights, such facts shall be deemed a denial by such state of the equal protection of the laws to which they are entitled under the Constitution of the United States ; and in all such cases, or whenever any such insurrection, violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, opposes or obstructs the laws of the United States, or the due execution thereof, or impedes or obstructs the due course of justice under the same, it shall be lawful for the president, and it shall be his duty, to take such measures, by the employment of the militia of the land and naval forces of the United States, or of either or by other means, as he may deem necessary for the suppression of such insurrection, domestic violence, or combinations.

Acting under these statutes and others like them the president of the United States ordered troops to the city of Chicago. This was done for four purposes: (1) to protect federal property; (2) to prevent obstruction in the carrying of the mails; (3) to prevent interference of the interstate commerce; and (4) to enforce the decrees and mandates of the federal courts.

Upon the entry of the federal troops into the city of Chicago, the governor of Illinois demanded of the president their withdrawal, asserting that the action of the federal government was "in violation of a basic principle of our institutions." To this the president briefly replied that "federal troops were sent to Chicago in strict accordance with the Constitution and laws of the United States, upon the demand of the post-office department that obstruction of the mails should be removed, and upon representation of the judicial officers of the United States,

that processes of the federal courts could not be executed through the ordinary means, and upon abundant proof that conspiracies existed against commerce between the states."

It is evident that the controversy is over the constitutional power of the president to act, and to settle the dispute let us turn to the Constitution itself.

Besides requiring the president to take oath that he shall "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States," it is further required of him that "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

It is provided also that "The Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district . . . and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the state in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings." In accordance with this provision, the federal government has erected costly buildings within the city of Chicago. At times it has within such buildings immense stores of treasure. If a mob threatens the destruction of these buildings and the robbery of the wealth stored therein, must the federal government await the application of the state authorities before proceeding to protect its own property? The question has one answer only. The president had ample authority in sending troops to Chicago to guard the property of the government.

"The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

Interstate commerce is peculiarly under the control of the federal government. The Supreme Court of the United States has often been called upon to declare null and void regulations of such commerce by the states. Congress has passed numerous laws controlling it. If these laws are violated, whose duty is it to bring the offenders to justice? Is the state of Illinois aggrieved that the federal government attempts the execution of its own laws? Would not that state be more aggrieved if the United States were to attempt to compel the state to execute the

federal laws? Illinois has not the power, even if she has the disposition, to punish those who interfere with commerce between the states.

"The Congress shall have power to establish post-offices and post-roads." This would be an idle power if the government of the United States had not the right to punish obstructions in the carrying of the mails. No express power is given so to punish, but as was once said by a justice of the Supreme Court, there is not one express provision in the Constitution but what draws after it a train of implied powers. Congress has passed numerous laws under this provision. It has provided penalties for violations of such laws. And if violence prevents the due execution of those laws, is it for the state of Illinois to say that the federal government shall not punish the offenders against such laws?

"The Congress shall have power to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions." As this clause follows the clauses providing for the raising and regulating of the land and naval forces, it is evident that it merely gives the federal government additional forces to execute the laws when the regular forces are inadequate or not available.

But it was made to appear to the president that the federal courts were unable to enforce their mandates or execute their decrees. The Constitution provides: "The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority."

When the federal government was established, the judiciary was considered the weakest branch of it. The courts could pronounce judgments, but of themselves they could not appoint officers to enforce their decrees. Congress must first provide for officers of the courts, and the president must then appoint. The courts are not empowered to advise even who shall be appointed. And if such officers are unable to enforce the mandates of the courts, the executive must be called upon to execute them. In 1832, when the Supreme Court was unable to execute

its judgment against the state of Georgia involving the rights of the Cherokee Indians, and when it called upon the executive for aid, President Jackson refused to assist the court. He did not refuse because he thought he lacked the power, but for the reason that he hated an Indian, and he hated Chief Justice Marshall even more than he did an Indian. "John Marshall has pronounced his judgment," said Jackson, "let him enforce it if he can." But we have already seen that it is the duty of the president under the Constitution and the laws to enforce the decrees of the courts, when the ordinary course of justice is obstructed. And in so doing he is not required to await the sanction of the authorities of the state.

Within the same territory the courts of the nation and the state sit side by side. The mandates of both courts may be directed to the same individual. The officers of both courts may, in executing the decrees of their respective tribunals, traverse the same grounds. The courts of the nation do not sit within a state through the comity of such state, but through their own right. Their officers do not execute their decrees through the graciousness of the state government, but under and by virtue of the Constitution and laws of the Union. And when the federal army is sent within a state to assist in enforcing the decrees of the federal courts, that army is not within the state as a matter of comity, but of right. The state is not invaded by the forces of a foreign government. The federal army does not come to make war upon the state government. Within its proper sphere the federal government has the same right of obedience to its laws and the same power of punishment for violation of such laws as has the state in its sphere. The line of demarcation between the federal and state governments is not territorial, but is on the one hand the enumerated powers of the federal government, and on the other the reserved powers of the state. While the troops of Indiana may not without permission pass over into Illinois, the federal army may do so; for, in the language of Attorney-General Olney, "the soil of Illinois is the soil of the United States."

W. W. QUATREMAINE

THE FIRST YEAR OF THE ADMINISTRATION: A REPLY.

BY DUANE MOWRY, ESQ.

A WRITER in THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS for May, 1894, discusses the work of the first year of the present administration, and undertakes to place an estimate on that work, with the one point clearly in view, as it seems, of establishing "that Mr. Cleveland has gone from blunder to blunder, from mistake to mistake, with the most unfaltering confidence, and to the most unfortunate results"; that his direction of the ship of state has well-nigh led to the wreck and ruin of the country; and that while the opportunities were ripe to display a high order of statesmanship in the executive department of the administration, the facts are that Mr. Cleveland and his advisers have utterly failed to develop that mental grasp and political foresight so necessary to meet the demands of the hour, and have been impotent to dispose of public questions of vital interest to, and in close touch with the people, and have in all respects proven their inability to satisfy the public behests, or to supply such reasonable and substantial relief as the conditions of the country seemed imperatively to demand.

Certainly, this is a formidable arraignment, and if true, as I am quite sure it is not, would be a most deplorable one for the party in power. If I have stated the position of the writer correctly in the foregoing, it will not be difficult to conclude that he is a rampant, uncompromising partisan; that his article is an attempted argument against the administration upon a narrow and extremely partisan basis; and that the quality of judicial fairness does not anywhere permeate his argument. I say this much by way of digression, because in this most excellent JOURNAL we are accustomed to have matters discussed on a higher plane.

The article asserts that "it has been the work of the year to test Mr. Cleveland by the most rigid and exacting standards, with the result of discrediting his capacity alike as a party leader, an executive, and a statesman." A public servant should always be "tested by the most rigid and exacting standards." And the criticism can be justly made that the public too rarely insist on such a test. I cannot agree with the writer in his conclusion that, so tested, Mr. Cleveland has been found wanting as an executive and as a statesman. While I am convinced that it is somewhat a matter of opinion, depending largely on the point of view you take of the man and of the condition of the country, I feel reasonably certain and safe in claiming that Mr. Cleveland has demonstrated on public occasions that he possesses a coolness of temper, an honesty of purpose, a dignity befitting his high office, a determination to be judicially fair to all interests in which his department is particularly concerned, and withal, a lofty and high-minded patriotism, far above and beyond the touch of greedy selfishness and low ambition, and farther still removed from the influence of mere party behests or expediency. And this attitude has been taken without being obstinate or self-sufficient, and with no appearance of offensiveness or personal ill will toward any who may disagree with him. Here, then, we have some of the qualities that well characterize the true statesman and place to the fore a great leader of men and of a nation. If Mr. Cleveland has not proven a success as a party leader, he has at least accomplished what no other citizen of this country ever could do ; he has been his party's standard-bearer for three successive campaigns, something that the great General Grant could not be, although dearly desiring to be. It is apparent that the sterling qualities of the man won the admiration of his party and made all opposition to him in the last national convention vanish like morning mist before the midday sun.

A successful party leader is usually a man fertile with expedients, but not necessarily great in the management of the affairs of statecraft, and rarely a statesman. He is able to leave some impress on the affairs of the hour, but seldom transmits to pos-

terity a record of which his countrymen and the world at large are proud. In the sense here indicated, I do not think that Mr. Cleveland has been a successful leader of his party. And I do not believe that any patriot need be ashamed of such a failure.

It is claimed that "Mr. Cleveland's second election brought uncertainty and disturbance to the business world"; that "the country was prosperous, and suddenly the brakes were applied." Unsupported statements are easily made. What are the facts? When Mr. Cleveland was elected the whole country was in a condition of unrest, of business excitement, and wild speculations. Why was it? If it was the fact of Mr. Cleveland's success at the polls, then it was brought about by an overwhelming majority of the people of this country, and the blame cannot attach to Mr. Cleveland. But that is not the answer. The faulty legislation of many years, legislation in the interest of a class or of classes, had about reached its apex. The Sherman silver law was the avowed offspring of political expedients and unstatesmanlike legislation. It had commenced its deadly work long before the November elections. The writer heard Mr. Sherman on a public occasion denounce it and admit it was mischievous. No well-informed financier was heard to defend it. The constant and increasing widening of the breach between employer and employee was a great and growing menace to the peace and prosperity of the country. The accumulations of extraordinary fortunes by the very few is always an alarming symptom in a representative form of government. These were growing at a rapid rate. And the condition of the working masses was not improving under the *régime*. Especially was this true of the agricultural classes. The foregoing is matter of history and cannot be gainsaid. Is it any wonder, therefore, that when Mr. Cleveland assumed control of the ship of state he found the condition of the country in a state of uncertainty and threatened business disaster? Is not the greater wonder found in the fact that it had been possible to prevent the volcanic eruption for so many, many months, if not a few years, under the high-water pressure of so much faulty business legislation in the states and in the Congress? Unusual and unhealthy quick-

ening of the public pulse is always followed by a relapse, and the patient is sometimes in imminent danger of dissolution. That was what was about to happen when Mr. Cleveland went into power.

The somewhat extraordinary article charges in effect that President Cleveland and his party were guilty of precipitating the panic of a year ago. The bare statement of such a wild and, as it seems to me, untruthful assertion, is its own best and complete answer. Such a claim well belongs to the political huckster and ward heeler. It is the stock in trade of the stump orator. It is political claptrap. To dignify it with a reply would be to recognize its truthfulness. The writer evidently forgets that conditions such as he depicts are a matter of growth, generally of slow and almost imperceptible growth, and do not manifest themselves spontaneously.

The writer referred to says: "Had Mr. Cleveland at the moment of his inauguration, or better still, before that, called in council a score of his party's recognized chiefs and shaped a definite tariff program and published it to the country, all the paralyzing influence of doubt and uncertainty would have been removed." In the light of recent events no one believes it. But I criticise the suggestion as inconsistent with true American principles. It would have justly subjected the party in power to condemnation for invoking un-American, impolitic, perhaps positively silly methods of public procedure. The president has no business to shape the tariff program. That is a matter for the Congress. I remember reading somewhere a provision which runs something in this wise: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives." I am impressed with the conviction that it will be well for us to observe this most wise and salutary provision. The executive is not and ought not to be the law-making power of this country. And while I do not doubt the patriotism of President Cleveland, no consideration of party policy or expediency should extend the functions of one branch of the general government to those of another. The writer's suggestion, if acted on, ought to be laughed at and I think would be, a farce. Instead of clearing the business

sky, it would have added to and complicated still more the threatening situation. Let there be no star chamber proceedings nor quasi-official conference of a junta of the political cohorts of any party.

The article argues that "had the administration issued a ringing declaration, asserting its purpose to maintain the public credit at all hazard, avowing its purpose to issue bonds in unlimited quantity, if necessary, the panic would never have come." It is easy enough to find fault. And it is not difficult to detect errors in every human institution. Whether the administration had the legal right to do what the writer claims ought to have been done is by no means certain in the opinion of some able statesmen. It is certain that there was a chance for an honest difference of opinion along this line, and to say that such action would have avoided the panic is another of the far-fetched statements of the article. It may be suggested in passing, however, that hindsight often proves itself in error when it stands on the pedestal of foresight. Perhaps our critic had forgotten that.

The time has passed away when the declaration, proclamation, and *pronunciamento* have any practical use in the active affairs of this country. As suggestive of some policy or voluntary line of action they are likely well enough. But like the confederation in the early history of this government, they are impotent to accomplish much, except where they anticipate the natural inclination. In the active affairs of the business and financial world, this method of human government would be a monumental farce. It could serve no useful purpose. Certainly no statesman would lend his vote or influence to such a line of official action.

That President Cleveland is hostile to pensions for the veterans of the late war is neither just nor true. That he is opposed to the wholesale onslaught on the public treasury by an army of undeserving and able bodied ex-soldiers is conceded. And he is sustained in this position by the loyalty and honest judgment of the yeomanry of this country. It is a matter of common notoriety and public shame that the pension depart-

ment has been the abiding place of the most contemptible jobbery and glaring frauds. Mr. Cleveland is a friend of the soldier, but not of the perjurer, the dead-beat, and fraud. He is entitled to the gratitude of his countrymen for his manly stand upon this question.

Some attempt is made to cast a suspicion on the administration's attitude toward the provincial government of Hawaii. It is fair to say that there might be some honest difference of opinion as to what should be the policy of this government on a state of facts such as Mr. Cleveland and the state department had to deal with in the Hawaiian matter. In my humble opinion, however, the judgment of history will approve Mr. Cleveland's course. It is not the policy of this government to encourage revolutions among powers friendly to it, and never to participate in them. Strict neutrality is the only safe and true ground for America to occupy. If by any act of this government the affairs of a friendly power have been interfered with, it is the duty of this country to right the wrong as soon and as fully as possible, consistent with duty to this country and to the powers immediately affected. This was all that was attempted.

There are some other charges made by the writer which I do not care to note in detail. Much that is said offers a fertile field for honest difference of opinion. But let me say right here that the high-minded discussion of the public acts of the servants of the people, if well-considered, intelligent, and honest, can never be hurtful. As intelligent, law-abiding citizens, we should welcome such a discussion, so conducted. It is the particular business of the people to scrutinize their public servants, to intelligently criticise them, and to approve or disapprove their actions, as such actions shall impress us as being right or wrong. In this country the people are the rulers. We should never forget that. And the honest judgments of the people are entitled to consideration and respect.

But I cannot bring myself to believe that the writer has, on the whole, given us a fair or temperate *resume* of the first year of the administration ; that he has even treated the subject in a conservative, partisan manner ; and that the spirit and tone of

the discussion is obviously conducted on a narrow and extremely partisan basis. And I am compelled to dissent from the logic of his position, because I think he has offered nothing that would have assured us a better state of affairs had his views been accepted and put into operation.

My personal view of the first year of the administration is that the feverish and unsettled conditions of the country were upon us when Mr. Cleveland went into the White House, and that he and the country at large were unable to afford relief, except as it might be secured by prompt and patriotic action of the Congress in special session assembled; that Mr. Cleveland has taken the public pulse aright, but that Congress has failed to meet the demands of the hour; that while legislation is not the panacea for all the ills to which a country is subjected, it often simplifies and improves business conditions, when enacted opportunely, and gives new life and vigor to the slumbering hope that is within us. This is preëminently not a one-man government, and the sins of omission or of commission, so far as they affect the public welfare, are the sins of no one man alone.

I agree with the writer that the administration was confronted with conditions that required the highest order of intellect and a statesmanship of the first quality. And I consider that they were both found in President Cleveland. But it matters little how great, how wise, how patriotic, the executive branch of the government may be, it can accomplish but little if the legislative brakes are implacably and unreasonably placed upon it. That this has been foolishly and unwisely done, the future historian of the present time will no doubt record.

DUANE MOWRY.

ECONOMIC COÖPERATION.

BY E. M. BURCHARD.

IF ONE should take up a volume entitled "Travels in Africa," and read in the opening paragraph that there was no such place as Africa, and find the rest of the volume devoted to proving that the alleged incidents of African travel really occurred in the United States, the narrators laboring under an hallucination of mind, he would experience sensations much like those of the reader of Stoughton Cooley's article in the June number of this magazine under the title of "Economic Coöperation."

Speaking of the various reformers who seek the betterment of mankind through coöperation, he says: "The searchers do not know that which they seek. Realizing that there is something lacking in the present system of production and distribution of wealth, they set off at a tangent to find the missing element without stopping to inquire what it may be." He states the purpose of his paper "to prove that we now have coöperation in which each producer gets the full returns of his labor, and in which the exchange of goods or services between producers is governed by a principle absolutely just and mathematically exact—barring the elements of monopoly." He begins with defining coöperation as "the rendering of service at cost." It is but fair to say that subsequently an exact definition of the word is given, but this is the idea which is made the basis of his argument.

If reformers really do not know what they want, and if what they would desire in case they were better acquainted with existing conditions is an abundant, present possession, what a vain beating of the air reform agitation has become! Not being authorized to speak for others, I can only say that coöper-

eration as a "rendering of service at cost" is the exact opposite of my own conception of the thing.

The coöperation which I seek is a rendering of service with the *largest profit to the server*. There is no such thing as "cost of service" to him who renders it; who receives the service can state the cost to himself—what he pays for it—but there is no cost of service to the server. Take the simplest case imaginable, that of a boy blacking boots. This is a business requiring skill, industry, and capital; but who shall determine the cost of a *shine* to the boy? And if it cannot be done in that which is least, it cannot be done in the greater.

It is not necessary to follow Mr. Cooley further in a quest that confessedly leads no whither. Had he but started for some point in particular he doubtless would have arrived somewhere. He has well delineated the prospect of *no hope*. Man lives by hope; and with the material of sustentation so cheap and abundant, it is a pity to put mankind on short rations.

Civilization differs from barbarism mainly in the matter of wealth-production. Wealth is not susceptible of indefinite storage; production does not therefore lead, but on the contrary it follows consumption. Necessity is the mother of invention, and precedes her children in point of time. Present industrial conditions are the result of an attempted inversion of nature; the genius of man is devoted to the work of production, while consumption, especially as regards the number of those who shall be allowed to consume, is restricted in every way. Man's power to consume is always in direct proportion to the extent of the reward of his toil; and it is, apparently, the single aim of the managers of society to reduce this reward, upon one plea or another, to the lowest point. Every clogging of the channels of trade due to the fact that labor has had too little of its product, is tried to be remedied by a reduction of wages—giving to labor a still smaller proportion of its product.

The labor question may be put in a nutshell: cause, labor robbed; effect, the products accumulating and trade dull; remedy, labor robbed a little more than before, and a general wondering of why times are so hard.

I understand it to be the mission of coöperation to reverse this practice, and, ultimately, to change the conditions which now obtain. Millions realize the nature of the condition that should be changed, they feel exactly the spot where the shoe pinches, they are most eager for change, but HOW?

The activities of society, so far as they relate to wealth, are threefold, and include its production, its distribution, and its exchange. Consumption always takes care of itself: it is the getting of the dinner upon the table that troubles the housewife of the poorer sort. By the production of wealth I mean taking the raw material, applying to it human labor, skill, and judgment, and bringing forth the *usable thing* or finished product; as when pig-iron becomes steel rails, cotton and wool become cloth, or leather is changed into shoes.

Industry is now specialized and localized. Goods are mostly made at a distance from the place where they are to be used, and consequently must be carried to the user. Distribution comes second in order of time, but precedes production in point of consequence, since production depends upon distribution, ceasing when it ceases. When wealth has been produced and distributed it only remains that it be exchanged, that the man who has produced food get rid of his surplus food (worthless to him), and get clothing, tools, boots, hats, etc., and that all the other producers get in exchange for their special products the other forms of wealth which they need.

Exchange, while the last process in point of time, is first in importance, since neither of the others can proceed without it. Exchange is the outlet pipe whose clogging stagnates all behind it. Society has not yet learned how to keep this outlet free who teaches her this secret shall be first in the kingdom of coöperation, because he will have been of infinite service to humanity. It may seem bold, at the close of the nineteenth century, to declare that man universally begins at the wrong end of economy; that he labors indefatigably, prodigiously, to create wealth and crowd it into the channels of trade without apparently paying any attention to keeping the outlet free; yet this is the plain, simple truth, and it remains for us to face it.

Man is a two-sided being ; his nobler powers and aspirations create in us conceptions of God ; his baser part reaches down to depths we care not to fathom. All his endeavors are two-sided, also, and are either to *give* or to *get*—to do or to obtain. Giving, helping, working, building—all this is noble and ennobling, but the whole business of getting gain appeals to man's baser part.

"It is better to give than to receive."

The characterization of Lord Bacon as "the greatest, meanest of mankind," was but testimony to his completeness as a man—it was *all there*.

Man has always produced wealth with his nobility and exchanged it with his meanness. Exchange has always, since the invention of money, been accomplished through trade, and trade calls into exercise all of man's meaner part ; it is its essence to *get* more than is *given*. The upward progress of humanity waits until exchange be freed from the domination of trade and be granted a channel of its own. And nothing is easier than to do this, once attention is called to the case, once the nobler part of man is awakened and shown the possibilities of the new path.

The genius and industry of man has triumphed over the difficulties of producing food, clothing, and shelter sufficient for his wants. Nothing is now easier than to do this. The difficulties of distribution have yielded to railroads and steamboats, and this is precisely the hour when destiny confronts him with the problem of exchange, and calls upon him to rise out of his meanness into his nobility.

Trade may be called the great feed-box of humanity. Men approach it not as gods but as brutes. Greed is the law of trade ; honesty is its best *policy*, but only policy—not principle ; and there is an infinite difference between policy and principle ; the one as much *includes* all that is mean as does the other *exclude* the same. There is confessedly enough wealth produced for all, even with involuntary idleness tying humanity's right hand, but it all goes into the trough of trade ; and while men facetiously call themselves bulls and bears, they are mostly

characterized by the habits of the hog in their business transactions. It is ever the aim of the stronger to shove the weaker aside, get all four feet into the trough, and to gulp down the greatest possible amount of the swill of vulgar wealth. The successful trader founds a university of learning; the successful hog, in a humbler way, furnishes his quota of lard and bacon; to any but the Jew, each is a success after his kind; but the actuating principle in both has been almost identical. In the art of coöperating to produce wealth man is already proficient, and he would not have stopped here, only distribution and exchange do not lie within the sphere of coöperative effort; they are *executive* functions.

We may only coöperate to produce the lawful means, and see to it that the execution is efficient. Nothing but the enactment of lawful provision for exchange will free production from the cruel, selfish domination of trade, which for thousands of years has made the trader lord and master, and the producer his more or less humble slave.

Exchange and trade cannot occupy a common channel any more than greed and justice can rule in the same heart. Exchange must have a lawful channel of its own; a small one at first, but with provision for growth. There can be no use of force; we may but set out the plant of exchange in this spring-time of a new century, fence it in from the bulls and bears and the hogs of trade, and let it grow. There will be plenty of friends to prune and water the sapling if there prove to be life in the stock.

Exchange is the art of giving to the worker the whole of his product in the form of any other worker's product, just as trade is the art of giving to the worker as little as possible of his product in the form of some other worker's product. It were well for the student to grasp this proposition before proceeding, for it contains the solution of the problem of the ages—the substitution of fair and free exchange for the robberies of trade. Exchange is accomplished when the products of labor have equal, lawful, and free access to a common reservoir out of which each worker may take as much of value as he has put in.

It does not follow that all products would seek the common reservoir, but freedom of access would govern transactions outside just as the fact that gold has free access to the mint governs the price of all gold everywhere. If but the hundredth part of production passed through the exchange channel, the fact that there was such a channel and that access to it was free, would confer all the advantages to be derived from actual entrance.

Three things are essential to a complete system of exchange. These are :

1. *Lawful valuation.*
2. *Safe custody.*
3. *A medium of exchange.*

We will consider them in their order.

1. *Lawful valuation.*

Goods cannot be distributed, except in a wholesale way, by means of bills of lading. Give to one man a receipt for a car-load of coal, to another a receipt for one hundred bushels of wheat, and to another a receipt for a case of cotton cloth, and they are still as far as ever from the point of economic exchange; but give to each the worth of his product in exchange currency, and each has the power to command so much of coal or wheat or cloth as he desires. This is the only perfect form of exchange, and its use presupposes a valuation of the goods. Neither the buyer nor the seller can be left to determine values, for their interests are opposed; they cannot coöperate; they can but contest. The work of valuation must be intrusted to duly appointed agents whose duty is lawfully defined, and this upon principles of exact justice. And it may be noted here that while the valuation at the start would be somewhat arbitrary, it would speedily become automatic in practice, since relative value must ultimately conform to the law of supply and demand. Whatever was less wanted would of necessity be priced lower, and whatever was more wanted would by an equal necessity be priced higher, so that however fallible the pricing agents might be, their work would instantly be revised, and soon corrected and perfected in a purely automatic manner.

2. *Safe custody.*

Wealth awaiting consumption must be in some custody ; if in that of the producer, he has the expense of storage, and meanwhile the wealth is a useless burden to him and inaccessible to others. Consumers will not buy much in advance of need. In order that production may be continuous there must be lawful storage of non-perishable, staple goods. This would relieve the producer and insure at once safe custody and universal accessibility. And the having of the surplus wealth in public custody would absolutely remove it from the arena of speculation and greatly facilitate the guidance of industry toward the most perfect supply of demand—two supremely desirable ends.

To the objection that we might be put to the expense of building some storehouses, it may be answered that those who have nothing require no place to put it.

3. *Exchange currency.*

An exchange currency is simply a form of paper, like money, and devoted to a single use. This currency would be issued in exchange for all goods offered at the receiving department, and it would be received for the goods ; in the meantime it would have accomplished the work of exchange. All the goods in custody would be owned by the holders of the currency, and payable on demand. All the expense of running the department could be met by a slight tax upon the goods. The accumulation of wealth could not, under this system, retard production, for the worker would have a perpetual market and a cash price.

The fact of supreme moment in this connection is that all surplus wealth would virtually be in possession of its makers, instead of as now wholly in the hands of speculators and traders, who use it for the destruction of those whose industry has produced it. Industry now, after supplying the luxury of the rich and the bare necessities of the working class, forges all the rest into a weapon and delivers it into the hands of her enemies for her own destruction.

This system would distribute an infinite amount and variety of wealth among an infinite number of producers, and accomplish economic exchange in accordance with the principles of justice. A bill to put into operation such a system has been

drawn and is now in the hands of a United States senator. It would surprise most persons to learn how few and simple are the terms of the proposed act. Such an act of legislation is simplicity itself when compared with a tariff law, and would be of vastly greater moment, but alas! there is no speculation in it, nothing but justice, and that too for the poor—the worker.

It is of utmost importance at this time to have clear ideas of what are the natural limits of coöperative effort; and the fullest investigation will show *that coöperation ends with completed production*. To coöperate is to operate together for the attainment of a common object. Men cannot coöperate to propel a boat with oars unless they desire to go the same way. The law of coöperation, then, is *identity of interest*. Men coöperate easily, instinctively, to produce wealth, because they all want it, and all that they can get of it; and united effort increases the aggregate product; but when it comes to the distribution and exchange of wealth, the interests which heretofore have been harmonious instantly become antagonistic, and the possibility of coöperation ceases to exist. It is the *natural law* of wealth-distribution and exchange that each man shall seek to get as much as possible for himself regardless of the right and welfare of others.

Civilization consists in superseding the natural law of human conduct by legal enactments in accordance with principles of justice; its height is not to be measured by the splendor of its achievements in art or science, but by the degree that principles of justice triumph over the instincts of natural selfishness. In all productive effort man's nobler nature is in the ascendant; the act of creation makes him a god. In the business of distribution and exchange man sinks to his meaner level and becomes a brute.

Two boys may coöperate to fill the wood-box with firewood, but they cannot coöperate to divide the nickel which rewards their common toil. This task must be delegated to some one, and it should be discharged in accordance with predetermined rules of equity. Should one boy permanently assume the task of distributing the common earnings, he would begin by taking

three cents for himself and giving the other boy two, and he would end with a division of four to one in his own favor; and as he became older he would, doubtless, call out the military in case of labor troubles. The struggle, the brutal fight, the everlasting scramble, for the possession of the wealth created by labor, which goes on unceasingly among Christian and heathen peoples alike, without any regard to right and justice, must give place to a distribution which shall be lawful, orderly, and just. Thus shall we demonstrate the reality of our civilization, now seriously called in question.

Economic exchange will not be compulsory, but a lawful provision for those who choose to use it. It will not be communism, for it will give to each his own product and the whole of it. It will not be anarchism, for it will be lawfully done; if, however, it should prove to be socialism, then will socialism appear a very good thing.

E. M. BURCHARD.

THE PHILADELPHIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE.

BY CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF.

THE American reading public has had ample opportunity during the past four years to inform itself of the counts in the indictment against city government in this country. From December, 1890, when President Andrew D. White's scathing and trenchant article appeared in the *Forum*, until the present, magazines and newspapers have published article after article showing in general and in detail how far short we have come of reaching a higher development in municipal government. The recent *Century* articles of Dr. Albert Shaw, dealing with municipal activities in German cities, where the growth in population and change in conditions have been as marked as in our own cities, show conclusively how far in the rear of our European sisters we are. No one disputes our wonderful industrial and commercial enterprise, but in the domain of municipal government we must confess that we have failed to apply our acknowledged business capacities, and the result has been that our cities have been poorly managed, and many of them have little to show in the form of permanent improvements for extravagant expenditures of money. There has been little or no exercise of business prudence and foresight in dealing with such purely business problems as the water and gas supply, transit, and street paving. Work has been done in a hap-hazard, slipshod way, and in place of carefully and consistently executed plans for all needed municipal improvements, we find public works hastily executed when they can no longer be put off, and then only so much done as the absolute necessities of the present exigency may require. The result is a patchwork that before long will prove inadequate to the growing needs of the community.

In dealing with the causes of this failure (if we must so call it, and it is much better to be entirely frank with ourselves), we must realize that partisanship in its most extreme form is aggressively rampant and thoroughly entrenched; that this compactly organized partisanship is unscrupulous in its use of spoils, and that the average good citizen (so-called) is the personification of apathy and indifference as to his civic duties, and entirely willing to let well enough alone. A casual observer can scarcely realize the immense power which these compact party organizations, known as "rings" or "machines," exert. Mr. William M. Ivins, formerly city chamberlain of New York, in a little book entitled "Machine Politics," traces the formation and describes the power and workings of such organizations, which chiefly owe their existence to their ability to control the spoils of office.

Proper party organization is justifiable, perhaps necessary; but an autocratic machine is neither justifiable nor necessary, but, on the contrary, dangerous and subversive of the highest principles of self-government. Take spoils out of office and the machine disappears. England's experience demonstrates this. The English civil service laws provide that all appointments must be made upon the sole basis of merit; that all promotions must be made upon the same ground; and that removals can be made only for cause. Government is considered a business and is conducted on a business basis. There is nothing like a machine in English politics. Not that there is less interest manifested in political questions than in the United States, but the interest is in policies, not in the maintenance of a party machine. England's experience is instructive on another point. Her best citizens take a lively interest in all political affairs. This is because there is no corrupt machine with the power to nominate men whose only ability lies in the manipulation of "wires," and no such deep-seated indifference on the part of citizens as ratifies the choice of the "ring" rather than take the trouble necessary to contest the election.

In national and state affairs we constantly see citizens of both parties blindly voting the ticket their respective machines have

nominated regardless of its fitness, on the plea that everything else must be laid aside until party success is assured. We find precisely the same state of affairs when we come to deal with city matters, and with much less excuse, for nearly every thoughtful man will admit that there is no political question involved in determining such questions as those of an improved water and gas supply, street paving, sewage, etc. Why men should vote for a mayor or councilman on the ground that he is a Republican or Democrat, any more than a stockholder in a corporation should vote for a president or director for similar reasons, is past comprehension; and yet this is what has been done year in and year out, and will be done in the future unless there can be produced a public sentiment that will insist that municipal questions must be settled on business grounds and entirely apart from considerations of national or state politics.

The limits of this article prevent more than a passing reference to one disastrous result of the existence of the machine and the indifference of the people, which in turn becomes a potent cause of bad municipal government, namely, the power which large corporations seeking special and unusual and valuable privileges exert by means of corrupt bargains with the machine.

Philadelphia is no better off than other large American cities. The conditions referred to exist here as elsewhere. Its politics are in the control of one of the shrewdest, wisest, and most successful "combines" ever organized. Shrewd because it persuades the citizens that they have their own way; wise because its members do not indulge in vulgar and ostentatious display; successful in that they control absolutely every office in the city, and have complete and final say as to policies and candidates. The citizens regularly ratify the decisions of the machine because party expediency demands it.

Its public works, like the gas and water plants, are sadly inadequate to the present, not to mention the future, needs of the city. A councilmanic committee to investigate the conditions of gas works reported: "Your committee can state, without hesitation, after two very careful examinations, that the physical

condition of all our works is bad in the extreme. One could not conceive of a large business plant, run upon business principles, in such a condition without reflecting unfavorably upon its owners." Reporting further as to the condition of the largest of the city's plants, it says: "The general appearance of these works is that of decay and dilapidation." About another it says: "It possesses nothing itself but the most antique appliances for making its own gas." Yet councils, with these and other equally convincing facts before them, have done nothing. The mayor and his director of public works have repeatedly urged action upon a plan to secure an adequate water supply but councils have not appropriated a dollar to commence the work.

The work the Municipal League of Philadelphia has set itself to do is to create a public sentiment that will be intolerant of bad government and will consciously and persistently demand the maintenance of the highest possible municipal standard. It will be recognized that it is no small effort, but it is a campaign that must be fought out "if it takes all summer." There may be many sorties, many skirmishes, many assaults on the citadel of the enemy. It may be that we shall have to take considerable time to get into an advantageous position to make the final assault, but as Dr. Ecob has pertinently said, "Good generalship will take a month to reach the strategic point for a battle that lasts but a day."

The League is working to inform the citizens of the facts they exist, to acquaint them with the methods that will yield permanent reforms, to gather the people into organizations to which they may be able to meet, and in time overcome the bands of selfish politicians now in complete control of the city.

The educational features of the League's work consist in the liberal use of printer's ink and in judicious appeals through the press and its speakers. The League's pamphlets already published are: "The Duties of Citizens in Reference to Municipal Government," by Rev. W. I. Nichols; "The Limits of Party Obligation," by Henry Budd, Esq.; "A Proper Standard for Municipal Affairs," by Theodore M. Etting, Esq., for nine years

conspicuously faithful representative of the people in the upper chamber of our local legislature, now an active member of the League's board of managers; "The City of Philadelphia, Its Stockholders and Directors," by Charles Richardson. This latter pamphlet is an exposition of the wasteful, almost criminal, disregard manifested by councils in their dealings with the street railway companies, to which they have granted enormously valuable privileges and franchises for indefinite periods and for inadequate returns. Mr. Richardson's figures show that at least \$50,000,000 have been lost to the city by these improvident grants.

This and other pamphlets have been so distributed that they have had a hearing out of proportion to the actual number printed. For instance, the newspapers in their news columns reproduced the salient points. The ministers to whom they were sent incorporated the facts in their sermons, and these sermons were in turn reported by the newspapers. In addition to these longer pamphlets, intended largely for the more thoughtful reading public and leaders, the League has distributed thousands of one and two page circulars. Nearly 80,000 of one of these dealing with the League's work were distributed broadcast throughout the city.

The plans for the autumn and winter work along these lines include the publication of pamphlets and a series of circulars dealing with the gas question; with the question of political assessments among municipal employees, into which the League has made some interesting and valuable investigations; with what Philadelphia papers think of our councilmen; and with the municipal conditions of Philadelphia and Berlin.

The League has at its call a corps of advocates ready to speak at all times and places in its behalf. They have appeared before churches, labor unions, lyceums, associations, societies, and clubs. They open up the way for further arguments and for the dissemination of literature, and they are always on the alert to secure recruits and impress them into service. The coming winter will see this department of the work still more thoroughly organized, and the coöperation of such organizations as the

Christian Endeavor Societies and Young Men's Christian Associations through Good Citizenship committees is expected to yield good results in stirring up interest and crystallizing attention. Parlor meetings serve an excellent end in that they enable the speakers to meet through social channels those who cannot be reached in any other way. The League holds but few public meetings under its own auspices, except during a political campaign. This because it feels that for the present it can reach larger numbers through already constituted channels. People are reached by an address before a church or labor union at one of its regular meetings, who could not be induced to come to a purely Municipal League meeting.

The direct object of these educational methods is to arouse the citizens to the importance of the municipal problem and to urge them to bestir themselves to bring about a permanent change. They must precede what we call our practical methods, namely, those that are directed to organizing the citizens and the election of candidates. They must precede and accompany the efforts at organization. The Municipal League is comprised of ward associations, which are in turn comprised of division associations. Fifty or more members of the League residing in a ward may form themselves into a ward association, which is governed by an executive committee of ten members elected at large and one delegate from each division association. The ward executive committee elects a delegate to the central board of managers.

The object of the ward associations is "to enable all those citizens of the ward who believe in the complete separation of municipal business from state and national politics to coöperate in the nomination and election of candidates for city offices, and in securing a practical, business-like conduct in all purely municipal affairs," in a word, more effectively to carry out the fundamental principles of the League; the elimination of state and national politics from municipal affairs; the adoption of the principles of civil service reform; and the conduct of the city on non-partisan and business lines. The ward association has the power to decide when it or any of the division associa-

tions shall nominate candidates for councils or for any public positions which are to be filled by the voters of the ward or any division thereof, and to carry on the campaign to secure the election of such candidates.

The aim of the division association is to organize for effective political action all those persons residing in the division in sympathy with the League's principles. It is a campaign committee to arouse and sustain interest in the smallest political division of the city, to bring into a compact organization all who are interested in the city's welfare, and to bring out the vote on election day. The division committee sends a delegate to the ward executive committee, the latter sends a delegate to the board of managers, which is composed of the ward delegates, the officers of the League, and twenty-five members elected at large. This board has general control of the policy of the League, can decide when to participate in an election and recognize ward associations. The present board contains four manufacturers, one electrician, one professor, one real estate dealer, two grocers, fifteen lawyers, one editor, one salesman, one importer, three ministers, two doctors of medicine, four merchants, one architect, four retired gentlemen.

The weak spot of Philadelphia's government lies in its councils. Justly or unjustly, they rest under the suspicion of being swayed by improper motives and by corrupt means. It is to change this condition that the principal efforts of the League have been and are being directed. It has succeeded in replacing some positively bad men by negatively good men, and some mediocre men by positively good men. This is slow work but the League can proceed only as fast as the public sentiment will permit it. In one of two instances it has had to nominate the best available man, not the best possible man. But it is by replacing the bad by a little better, and the little better by a little better still, that progress is made. As some one has said : "No philosopher's stone of a constitution can produce golden conduct from leaden instincts. No apparatus . . . can compensate for the want of an internal governing sentiment. No legislative manipulation can eke out an insufficient morality into

a sufficient one. No administrative sleight of hand can save us from ourselves." So nothing will give the city of Philadelphia or any other city good municipal government, unless the people consciously demand it and will be satisfied with nothing else. To evolve a new set of conditions and a new public sentiment that will tolerate only the best and nothing but the best, is the problem to which this generation must address itself.

CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF.

GOVERNMENT BY PARTIES.*

BY THOMAS G. KITTRELL.

A GOVERNMENT by the people is essentially a government by political parties. However free every man in our country may be to express his political opinions, or seek to reduce them into practice, it is nevertheless through the medium of party that he casts his vote or attains to public office. It is party that places new-born principles before the people and sifts the material for candidates; it is party that shapes and directs public policy and administers the government. And by parties is meant organizations built not on questions of surface expediency, but on great and comprehensive principles; and which differ not so much in abstract maxims as in the application of these maxims under the stress of events.

Yet parties have not been universally accepted as the natural and necessary means through which the people shall discharge their functions as the governing power. Through every year of our country's existence the system has found its opponents. James Monroe looked forward from his peaceful administration to the time when there should be no parties, and believed that "the extinction of party strife was the ultimate triumph of republicanism." Other men have held this opinion, and have hoped that parties were but a temporary growth which would die with the gradual development and perfection of republican government. And to-day, because the boss has at times supplanted the statesman, because the machine has at times taken the place of honest party organization, party itself has borne

* American Institute of Civics' "Hall Prize" Essay. The writer, a member of the class of 1894 of Vanderbilt University, received one of the annual awards offered by the Institute of Civics to members of graduating classes in American colleges submitting the most meritorious essays on subjects within the scope of civics. This and similar papers furnish evidence as to the valuable results of this annual inter-collegiate competition.

the censure of evils from which no method of office-seeking can be free.

Our national experience has taught us that this system is the natural offspring of our form of government, and not less than our other institutions, looks for a gradual shaping and perfection at the hands of the people. Political parties are born of public wants. Their beginnings are found in the birth and growth of ideas and convictions, which gradually create in the mind of the citizen a new ideal of public policy. There must have been Democrats before there could have been a Democratic party; and its beginnings are to be traced in the processes which developed in citizens the spirit and purposes of democracy. Every state, like a living language, is constantly passing through some phase of its development; every phase gives birth to new questions and new principles to be dealt with by the governing power. In the advocacy of these principles the political party is born.

The useful functions of party are apparent to almost every voter. The very keenness of the strife between them makes them most effective in educating the citizen in political affairs. There is no higher educating influence for intelligent citizenship than the sharp presidential campaigns with their long previous preparations which occupy the minds of the people almost two years out of every four. This is the agency whereby the crude first thoughts and blind first feelings of the people are transformed into the rational thinking and feeling which is public opinion.

While partaking of the nature of a national educator, not less efficiently does it serve to enlist the interest of the citizen in the government. The right of every competent man to take part in the affairs of the government by vote or otherwise is a duty not less than a privilege, and we must look to the organization and spirit of party as the chief and almost the sole means of leading the citizen to the active and intelligent discharge of this duty. Our republic has no other agency for shaping, propagating, and applying governmental doctrines. Of what avail were northern discontent with slavery, without

organized parties to arraign the system before the people in all its details, and to make its abolition a question of public policy? Firmly as our people cling to the right to govern themselves, it is, nevertheless, a right which they are slow to exercise. It has been clearly shown by an eminent economist that the part of our population which votes most in accordance with living issues, which meets the demands of the times and escapes a dangerous conservatism, is to be found about the active political centers within easy reach of party weapons. It is by organizing the public opinion which they help to form that parties draw into active service the popular power in which government is vested. And it is by presenting to the voter a party platform clearly and distinctly outlined that he can understand precisely the policies and principles for which he is voting.

However much party antagonism may be deprecated and feared, its operation is wholesome in laying bare to the inspection of the people the administration of public office. What citizen so humble or so ignorant, but the searching light of opposing criticism reveals to him the course of every official and the working of every department of government?

The tyranny of the spoils system, together with the boss and machine, are the greatest evils with which parties are reproached. It is true that the custom has for a long time held of rewarding party devotion with the spoils of public office. But what is the history of its origin? It dates from the election of 1828, when there was but one party or rather many factions under one party name; when men ceased to organize in support of broad and comprehensive principles; when the great parties had fallen away, broken and disorganized. Then in the race for office the election descended from a lofty matching of principle against principle into a personal contest, the fiercest, the most bitter and scurrilous, the most fruitful of evil results, in the history of the country. It was at the end of this ignoble strife that Andrew Jackson inaugurated his eight years in power by sweeping the public offices for the benefit of his partisan supporters. It was thus that the very greatest evil associated with parties to-day sprung from a time when there was a lack

of party organization. The history of this and other elections teaches us that where party lines are disregarded, the election degenerates into a bitter and demoralizing personal contest. The long existence of the spoils system is no evidence of an incurable evil inherent in the nature of parties. Circumstances can never be more favorable to its growth than they have been in the past ; I refer to the long fight over the slavery question, when party strife, from sectional feeling, had touched the last chord of bitterness, and to that later period just after the war, when the Republican party from its great strength came to identify itself with the state. It is enough to point to the course of recent administrations which have made ability and honest worth the chief qualifications for appointment to office. However thorough may have been the application of the spoils system in the past, the present generation is looking upon its gradual downfall before the opposition of high-minded leaders and statesmen.

(Nor can it be better maintained that the political boss and machine are distinctively the outgrowth of party or its necessary attendants.) They meet with no hindrance so effective as activity on the part of the citizens which is aroused by vigorous party campaigning. Chicanery in politics accomplishes most where the citizens fail to take part in political affairs. There is no better illustration of this truth than the late elections in New York and New Jersey, in which the people awoke from the long imposture of corrupt rings, and carried out the election along well-defined lines of party policy. As long as remunerative public offices are at the disposal of popular suffrage, or open to the aspirations of every legal citizen, just so long will they have to be guarded by a vigilant commonwealth from incompetent and dishonest men ; for our politics can never be far above or below the level of our national character. In the language used by Grover Cleveland in the last campaign, "Ideal patriotic aspirations and unorganized good intentions cannot contend successfully for the mastery against the combined efforts of private avarice and greed."

We grant the concession that political organizations in states

and municipalities are prostituted for private ends; but we refer this evil to the close union maintained between national politics on the one hand, and on the other that of the state and municipality. Compared with the latter, national politics are pure. The greatest blemish upon American institutions is the corrupt leader and ring that dominates our cities; it is the state legislature that sells itself to the railroad corporation. State governments, as proven by an eminent economist, are constantly declining; their existence has been marked by ever-narrowing restrictions placed upon legislatures as a guard against corruption. Does not this evil point to the necessity of separating state and national politics, and of shaping platforms according to principles of state and municipal government? You are familiar with the spectacle of a national election, where voters are presented with a ticket headed by the representative of some great national principle, and below, skulking under the same party name, a state, county, or ward politician, who perhaps represents merely his own selfish interests or that of his clique. The energy of our parties has been absorbed by questions of national policy, almost to the exclusion of matters pertaining to the separate states, and until the two elections are separated, and state politics are based on distinct platforms, the party devotion of the ignorant masses will be the capital of demagogues.

If, therefore, the inference is correct as to the usefulness and need of strong party organization, surely party zeal is a virtue. In the language of Edmund Burke, "It is impossible to conceive that any one who believes in his own politics or thinks them to be of any weight should refuse to adopt the means of having them reduced into practice. It is the business of the speculative philosopher to mark the proper ends of government; it is the business of the politician, who is the philosopher in action, to find out proper means toward those ends and to employ them with effect." But how close shall be this allegiance to party? Whether a man be influenced to change his ballot by the character of a candidate or by some temporary issue, the causes for this change should indeed be grave. It

may well be questioned whether a man can ever justly withdraw his ballot from a great party in support of some temporary or class or local issue. When faced by the doubtful character of a candidate it becomes a question of ultimate expediency whether he is justified in opposing a great principle in which he believes, and to which he is devoted, in order to protect an office from a corrupt official. It is true that a party candidate represents a principle, but it is one whose application is to be largely modified by his own personal character. The case does arise in which the elevation to official power of a man whose influence is corrupting and demoralizing would be fraught with greater evil to the country than the temporary failure of a beneficent party policy. But the instance must indeed be one where that influence would be far-reaching, and it were better that the patriotic citizen err on the side of party devotion. Let him labor for the highest interests of his party if he would be loyal to his country. Let him contribute not alone to its strength, but to the elevation of its character and the maintenance of those high motives which gave it birth; seeking ever to make it the worthy champion of a high faith, of beneficent reforms; and steadfast in his allegiance, not for one election, and not for one decade, but until his party belief shall have become an adopted part of his country's political faith.

THOMAS G. KITTRELL.

THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY.

BY THEODORE COX.

AT A time like the present, the problem involving the banishment of poverty from society is one of peculiar and transcendent interest. When, from causes whose nature we shall not discuss, the shadow of financial disaster lies cold upon the land, and the evil spirit of industrial panic holds the wheels of our workshops still in its heavy hand, driving hundreds of thousands of once busy workmen to swell the ranks of that vast army of the miserably poor which stands as a perpetual menace to advancing civilization all over the world, this most mysterious, most profound, and yet most important question with which humanity has to deal forces itself upon our attention with irresistible power.

That this problem is truly the greatest with which we have to deal to-day, and that its correct solution would entail such infinite benefit upon us as to almost realize the so ardently longed-for millenium is, I think, readily apparent. From the earliest periods of man's history we find that all social strife has had as its corner-stone the desire of those who have worldly wealth to remain in possession of the same, as opposed to the equally powerful desire on the part of those who are not so fortunately situated to acquire that possession. There has been one long battle between the rich and the poor. The earliest tribesmen fought over their flocks and their pastures. The Vandals were tempted by the wealth of Rome. Within the gates of the Eternal City the patricians and plebeians divided upon the same line. What was the cry of the first revolutionary mob of Paris? "Give us bread!" The lower we go through the planes of human organization, the more highly developed do we find this elementary bone of contention—the desire to have

—until finally when we reach the animal kingdom we find it the *only* cause of strife.

In a comparatively new country like ours, the all-important character of this social force is not so clearly apparent as in an older and more thickly settled community. For, in all underpopulated regions, such as those tremendous tracts of farming country which still form the overwhelmingly larger part of this nation's territory, there are few very rich men and an almost equal scarcity of paupers, while starvation is almost a myth. The fathers or grandfathers of the people found in such districts came into the country, as a rule, pretty equally placed in regard to worldly wealth, and likewise equally adapted to the life of a tiller of the soil. They found a country practically without inhabitants, and each pioneer was enabled to take to himself as many acres as he could use, and that number did not, of course, vary much in their separate instances, since every man is gifted with about the same amount of bodily strength, and hence each could cultivate about the same quantity of land as every other. Then those who came later were given equal portions by the government. Therefore, with this equal start, and with wealth dependent almost entirely upon bodily exertion, likewise a comparatively fixed and invariable quantity, there was naturally but a single great social plane. All being thus more or less equally situated in regard to worldly wealth associated together as equals and friends. And, as to sink beneath that plane one could not reach another where he might forget his pride among new associates similarly placed with himself, or bolster it up in contemplation of others still below him in the social scale, but was compelled to stand out as either a pitiful or contemptible exception to mankind in general in the eyes of his everyday associates, there was given every opportunity for the display of that inborn spirit in man that makes him dread to be considered different from other men, if that difference brings upon him their ridicule or contempt. It is this same characteristic that is responsible for the fact that so few men are found willing to uphold unpopular opinions, or wear peculiar dress. An intimate knowledge of New England

country life has convinced me that it is owing to this cause, almost solely, that these people are able to support their poor as they do. Poorhouses abound and yet are rarely overcrowded, for a man there will suffer to the brink of starvation, as a rule, before suffering the disgrace of entering one of these asylums and thus being set apart from his fellow-men.

But the moment that great towns begin to form we find a total change in the social conditions. Brain of a certain kind takes the place of muscle, and men's brains differ vastly more in quantity and quality than do their bodily sinews. Hence, the cunning and wily amass untold wealth while the intellectually weak starve. It becomes an absolute impossibility for him who lacks the crafty mind to acquire a noticeable part of the good things falling to his more sagacious brother, and consequently he is obliged to sink beneath the latter, no matter how desperately he struggles to maintain his footing. Then, too, as it is an impossibility for all of the swarming thousands of a large town to be personally known to one another, as are the people of a rural district, it follows, as a matter of course, that those of a kind mingle together. The rich naturally seek the company of the rich, while the various grades below are but so many exclusive circles. Of course the members of each circle are not all known to one another, but each member finds his companions in his circle alone. Nor is there longer the same restraint that holds the member of a rural society to a single plane. For now the step is not so very great from plane to plane but what one sinking through them will always have company, and others still further down to look up to him.

No sooner are the classes distinctly formed than class hatred develops in the human breast. Each class envies and then hates the one above it. The starving wretch, threading some fashionable thoroughfare, gazes upon the stony walls of the surrounding palaces behind which teem everything that makes life happy, but which are as surely closed to him as though the street were an endless gorge carved in the living rock. He thinks of the much vaunted principle, that all are equal, and which he has never heard contradicted, and yet he knows that he

is no more equal to the inhabitants of yonder houses than is the lowest Siberian serf equal to the czar of all the Russias. Can one blame him, then, for believing that he has been cheated somehow by these people, and hating them for it, or for following blindly after the first leader who rises with a promise of real equality upon his banner?

Thus we see that only where real equality exists can we hope for successful republican government, or, in other words, the New England town-meeting is as characteristic of that region as Tammany Hall is of New York, or class rule is of Europe. Therefore, the question upon whose solution hangs the very existence of our republican institutions is the problem of poverty, or how can be cut away from society the very lowest planes, and at the same blow practically extinguish the upper ones and again approach that condition of practical equality that exists only in the rural portions of our country. That we would banish the rich by banishing the poor is consequent upon the fact that the work now done by the very lowest grades of humanity would then be necessarily performed by better paid labor, and thus by vastly raising the price of labor and consequently the price of everything else, we would leave little room for the accumulation of vast fortunes.

Some may think that the only correct answer to the question is a return to rural life by the civilized peoples of the earth. But in the first place such a return is impossible, and, secondly, it would not have the desired effect. For rural life is only an incentive to equality once established, since there have existed many oligarchies in agricultural regions. Personally, however, it seems to me that the right path has been indicated by Malthus in his great essay on population. Now, none will dispute that the breeding of men is dependent upon the same conditions as the breeding of any other animal. Hence, if we keep the sexes apart there can be no births. It is likewise evident, I think, that by allowing the poor to multiply unchecked, save by the laws of nature, we are breeding a *race*, as it were, of people who overstock the labor market and thus lower the condition of the workingmen in general and increase

that feeling of unrest and discontent that is fast growing into a menace to civilization. Therefore, why not enact legislation prohibiting marriage until the couple desiring to enter into the bonds of matrimony are capable of furnishing sufficient means of subsistence to provide comparative comfort to an average sized family? If this could be successfully accomplished few can doubt that the poor would soon be practically extinct.

There are two chief objections to such a plan. The first and most important of which is that the poor would continue to breed without the formality of marriage, and thus the law would but lower their condition without gaining the required end. But by enacting at the same time severe penal laws attaching heavy penalties to the illicit breeding of children, I think this objection would be overcome. The second of the charges that those who object to such a law bring, is that if successful in the accomplishment of its purpose it would act as a premium on sexual vice. And this objection is undoubtedly true and valid. But it seems to me that such a condition would be a small price to pay for the vast benefit to mankind consequent upon a banishment of poverty from the social structure. I have been in few portions of this country where morals are as loose, in this respect, as in the rural portions of New England. And yet can their condition be compared, for a moment, with that of the population of New York City? Which is preferable? Can we not make that small sacrifice in order to banish at one blow the cloud which hangs with gathering blackness over the civilization of the nineteenth century?

THEODORE COX.

THE STUDY OF THE PROBLEMS OF THE DAY.*

BY REV. HAMILTON M. BARTLETT.

THE present age is peculiar among other ways in that it forces upon public attention a wide range of topics of thought. The political, sociological, educational, and religious problems of our own country, coming up in every variety of form, demand consideration, while our opportunities of knowing what is being said and done everywhere, make the public questions of all other peoples of intense interest to us also. The result is that one who would fit himself to discharge life's responsibilities wisely, must have a wide range of intellectual vision; he must keep abreast of the developments of his time and make himself familiar with a thousand questions which did not come within the horizon of our fathers.

The necessity of doing this has given rise to journalism, the field of which has been steadily enlarging. It has two legitimate ends, the one of informing us of the best, not the worst, which is being said and done in the world, and the other of editorial discussion of every problem of current interest. The latter is undoubtedly its highest function. It is the one which has been the most neglected and abused, but which is now assuming its rightful importance. It is being increasingly recognized that an appeal to reason is what the widest public demands, and that in the impartial and fearless discussion of current problems journalism has an unparalleled opportunity for usefulness. Influenced by this conception, journalism has vastly improved its intellectual and moral tone within the last decade, and may be trusted to improve it much more in the future. It has attracted to its service many of the most gifted men of the time, who in any other age would have been statesmen, lawyers,

*This article will also be found in a *brochure* relating to the plans of the Extension Department of the A. I. C. now in press.

or clergymen. It is now possible to find in the columns of secular, religious, or literary periodicals every week a large amount of matter conceived in the best spirit, written in the best form, and giving the best available discussion of the most serious questions of the time. Much of this is written by specialists, by men who are recognized authorities, who have no other end in view except to serve the public, and who recognize the press as the best possible medium of communication with the public. The range of these articles includes every variety of timely topic. They afford information, and their discussion offers instruction which the most of us have no possibility of finding elsewhere. We have the alternatives only of reading them or of remaining in ignorance of some of the most important problems of our times, the right solution of which is essential to the welfare of our country.

There can be no question that the ideal citizen will make himself familiar with these current topics of thought. Democracy has given the people the privilege, and thrown upon them the responsibility, of solving the problems of society in their own way. Political, social, educational, and religious questions are not now solved by a few philosophers, statesmen, or ecclesiastics, but they are thrown into the arena of public discussion, and are eventually settled in accordance with the popular verdict. Public opinion is the new king which this age has enthroned in place of an hereditary sovereign. The development of the time is in the direction of giving public opinion a more imperative voice, and of submitting a wider range of topics to its decision. This is a tendency which has the greatest possibilities, either of good or evil—of evil if the people remain uninformed, their opinion thereby being worthless; of good if they are taught to examine widely, profoundly, and fairly, and thereby acquire the power of deciding wisely. Nothing, not even despotic authority, can be worse for a country than an uninformed public. It is sure to be the victim of demagogues and charlatans, making the worse appear the better cause, and using it for their own nefarious ends. The opportunity of all social parasites is gone, however, when the public is well

informed. Then its judgments are usually correct. This is the ground of faith in democracy, that the people can be trusted to decide wisely when they have informed themselves upon the merits of a question.

Unfortunately we have a very ill-informed public. The people are, of course, always ignorant until they have been instructed. But in this country the most have been too busy about other matters to gain adequate instruction. Moreover, we have welcomed so many foreigners, necessarily ignorant of our language and institutions, and have so generously accorded them all the rights of citizenship, that the educational average of the people has been lowered. The result is that the gravest questions are being decided by a jury that, for the time, at least, is blind and deaf, being able neither to see things in their true relations nor to hear the arguments. We have only one remedy. The people must be taught to think about these questions which we ask them to answer. They must recognize that their right solution is vital, not only to the prosperity of the country, but to its safety and the continued happiness of its people. They must be made to feel that he is an unworthy citizen who does not seriously undertake to inform himself upon all questions which come within the limits of popular discussion and decision.

There is only one place where this work of instruction can begin, and that is where all higher education begins—in the schools. Whether it shall be begun or not is simply a question of self-preservation. Democracy imposes new duties and responsibilities upon the individual; it should therefore adapt the education it offers to prepare him to discharge them wisely. It requires, in some respects, a system of education of its own. It must be admitted that it is possible to add another branch to public instruction, giving to those who are fitted to use it the opportunity of studying current topics of thought, as presented in a judiciously chosen series of quotations from the best discussions of the secular, religious, and periodic press. If the plan is feasible it is certainly desirable, and for reasons which only need clear statement to make their force apparent.

In the first place such a course of study would prove a valuable means of education and culture. The end of education is undoubtedly not only to develop the mental and moral faculties, but also to adjust one properly to the duties and responsibilities of life. But what shall be said of that system of education which leaves out of account preparation for the right discharge of the duties of citizenship; which does not even remind us of the existence of the most serious public questions of our time? Plainly it is defective at a most essential point. Here, therefore, is a point where modern education should adapt itself to modern requirements; it should seek to enlarge the field of vision of youth beyond that of individual or material interests, and endeavor to set them thinking rightly upon matters of current discussion. Such instruction would be welcomed by a numerous class of young people. They are naturally interested in current questions. In their debating societies, in school and college, such topics are generally chosen for discussion. A course of study of timely topics would greatly quicken the intellectual life which shows itself in these discussions. It would make it certain that young men so taught would have a wide range of vision, breadth of culture, acquaintance with the best thoughts and most important events of their time, and throughout life be anxious students of affairs. This would produce the best results in every direction in which citizens act, making them more intelligent in the town-meeting, in the caucus, and at the polls. The study of current questions has bred such statesmen as Henry Clay, Horace Greeley, and Abraham Lincoln, and they are types of men who naturally grow out of such study. This is also essential to the widest culture and highest enjoyment of the intellectual and moral life; for current questions are of infinite variety and many of them of the profoundest importance. To be brought up in comparative ignorance of them is a misfortune. Any one who has his thought early directed toward them, under wise instruction, will have cause for life-long gratitude.

Moreover the proposed course of study would tend to destroy the partisan spirit in which most public questions, religious as

well as political, are now considered, and which is fatal to an intelligent decision. This is one of the most serious evils of the time. The worst elements in public life, and they are very powerful, do their utmost to discourage independent judgment and use every means to stimulate party spirit. Nothing else needs to be considered with such critical and judicial eyes as campaign literature. Therefore the most valuable acquisition which a citizen can make is the philosophic spirit which inquires in all directions and compares and weighs arguments. The study of current topics would develop this spirit. Young people so instructed would learn to do their own thinking and make their own judgments. They would not unquestionably accept the arguments of one paper or blindly support the policy of one party. They could not be deceived by charlatans nor be led by demagogues.

Besides, the influence of such study upon public discussion of current questions would be elevating. The newspaper is compelled by the laws of self-preservation to be something very like its constituency, and so also is the politician. They will appeal to the reason, they will stop insulting the intelligence of the people with such palpable fallacies and misrepresentations, if the public is intelligent and well informed; otherwise never. Nothing, therefore, can exert a healthier influence upon public discussion than the knowledge that increasing numbers of the brightest minds are being taught to discriminate between the specious and the true. If such instruction were continued for a generation its influence would be simply incalculable in compelling fairness in discussion and honesty in public life. There is no question of the future which would not thereby receive more intelligent consideration and more rapid solution.

And further, it is easily seen that such study would guide many gifted young men into a career. They would find the study of social, economic, political, religious, or educational questions the magnet which would draw them in the direction in which their capacities fit them to walk with the greatest personal delight and the widest usefulness. Education would thereby open the door widely, disclosing the greatest concerns of after life.

It is only natural to assume that many would find these themes so alluring that nothing but life-long study would satisfy. This age peculiarly needs that such doors should be thrown open widely. Commercial allurements were never greater; they should be balanced by showing the variety and charm of intellectual pursuits in their truly attractive light.

The strongest considerations of public safety and of individual advantage, therefore, urge the introduction of the study of current topics of discussion into the school, academic, and collegiate instruction of the time. Experiments already made in this direction make it evident that such a course would be immediately popular among the more intelligent pupils. While this number might be small, compared with the great number of youth who are growing up to citizenship, they would be the "saving remnant," the minority with clear ideas and right purposes, which ultimately is always successful in enforcing its views upon the majority. Ere long they would make it disgraceful for a citizen of this country to be ill informed, and impossible that the final appeal to the American people upon any question should be other than to reason and conscience.

HAMILTON M. BARTLETT.

THE TRUTH ABOUT "AUSTRALIA AND THE AMERICAN CONTINENT."

A CORRECTION OF SOME OF MR. HOPKINS' ERRORS.

BY GEORGE L. MYERS.

THE duty of editors is, of course, to edit, and there is no doubt that the majority of them do what they can to insure accuracy upon the part of their contributors. But even an editor cannot be an expert upon every imaginable subject, and the responsibility for inaccuracies in magazine articles must primarily rest with the writers.

The third paper in *THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS* for June is entitled "Australia and the American Continent," the writer being Mr. J. Castell Hopkins, who wishes to pose as an authority upon all questions connected with the federation of the British Empire. It has been asserted in Canadian newspapers that this gentleman, who is now an ultraloyal Britisher, was born in the United States and has never set foot upon the British Isles. Nevertheless, he writes monographs, largely composed of newspaper gossip, upon Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Balfour, and other statesmen, whom he has not even seen.

Having lately distinguished himself by making three errors upon matters of fact in an article upon Lord Rosebery in the April number of *The Forum*, he has now turned his attention to *THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS*. In fairness to Mr. Hopkins, it must be admitted that one of his mistakes, in reference to the new premier of Great Britain, was trivial, consisting merely of an assertion that the noble lord had already won the Derby, an event which did not take place until June 6—more than two months after Mr. Hopkins' article was printed.

The misstatement to which attention is now asked is of a

serious character and requires contradiction. Upon page 601 of the issue of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS already referred to, the following sentence will be found: "All of the Australian colonies have varying tariffs against each other, *and under an imperial statute none are allowed to discriminate in favor of one another,** or of a foreign country." The portion of the statement printed in italics is absolutely untrue; the last five words are technically correct, but they are misleading, because no explanation is vouchsafed of the reason for the existence of the "imperial statute." Indeed, their accuracy is an accident, as Mr. Hopkins clearly shows that he is ignorant of the all-important provision of the law to which he refers.

At an intercolonial conference held in Melbourne in 1871, it was proposed to establish a customs union of all the Australian colonies.

Another conference was held in February, 1873, and again "intercolonial commercial reciprocity" was demanded. Lord Kimberly, the colonial secretary, was apprised by cable of the wish of the conference, and, as a consequence, the Imperial Parliament passed the "Australian Colonial Duties Act."† This occurred twenty-one years since, and yet Mr. Hopkins, *mirabile dictu*, has neither read nor heard of the existence of any such statute!

The object of the act was to empower "each colony to impose or remit differential colonial duties, and constituted Great Britain as ranking only with foreign countries, among which there was to be equality with regard to duties on importation." This quotation is from Mr. G. W. Rusden's "History of Australia", Vol. III., p. 644, a book which Mr. Hopkins would do well to peruse before he again attempts to instruct the readers of this journal upon any Australian constitutional question.

It will be seen that this act does not, incidentally, forbid discrimination in favor of foreign countries.

A subsequent intercolonial conference was held in 1881, and intercolonial free trade was again discussed, yet no agreement was arrived at, and the matter still remains *in statu quo*.

* The italics are mine.

†36 and 37 Victoria, chapter xxii.

In 1885 the Imperial Parliament passed an act constituting a Federal Council of Australasia, "for the purpose of dealing with such matters of common Australasian interest, in respect to which united action is desirable, as can be dealt with without unduly interfering with the management of the internal affairs of the several colonies, by their respective legislatures." Of this assembly, Sir Charles Dilke writes: "It forms a pleasant little Parliament which meets at eleven and generally sits till lunch, for its average sittings are indeed shorter than those of any other legislative assembly with which I am acquainted; except that equally dignified body, our own House of Lords."

The Victorian general election of 1889 turned upon the side issue, growing out of the main policy of protection, of the answer to the question, "Australian or Victorian Protection?"

Mr. Hopkins' knowledge of Australian affairs must be extremely limited; had he read either "Greater Britain," or Sir Henry Parkes' "Fifty Years of the Making of Australian History," he would never have made the assertion that the Australian colonies cannot discriminate in favor of each other. In fact, had he casually perused the latter work, he would, in all probability, have refrained from writing the article which I am now endeavoring to correct and to elucidate.

The idea of two or more colonies, such as Canada and Australasia, separated by thousands of miles of ocean, discriminating in each other's favor and against the mother country may, perhaps, be the latest phase of the moribund fiscal federation fad, which all English statesmen from Mr. Gladstone to Lord Salisbury have repudiated upon the ground that it would involve a return to protection upon the part of the United Kingdom.

It should be observed that, although Mr. Hopkins advocates a customs union between Canada and Australasia, he refers (on page 597) to "when the time comes for local (Australasian) federation and a protective tariff against the world" How long the former policy is to continue, he does not mention; nor does he state that under the latter policy the population of Canada, during the ten years from 1881 to 1891, increased less than twelve per cent. And while he tells us something con-

cerning the views of Mr. Patterson, Sir Thomas MacIlwraith,* who has been premier of a colony containing 100,000 fewer people than there are in the city of Boston, and other Australian politicians, he omits to mention that Sir Henry Parkes, who has been four times premier of New South Wales (population 1,130,000), and whose opinion, by reason of his long experience, is of more value than that of anybody else in Australasia, is opposed to protection in any disguise, or under any name, although he is an ardent supporter of federation.

A few words as to the inability of Australian or other British colonies to discriminate in favor of a foreign country.

As is well known, British colonies possess no power to make commercial treaties; if an informal agreement is arrived at between a British colony and a foreign country, that agreement only becomes a treaty after sanction by the imperial government, and without such sanction it is null and void. The self-governing possessions of Great Britain, however, have the right of fixing their own tariffs, even with reference to imports from the mother country, provided that the duties which are levied are not of a discriminating character.

There are at present in force at least two commercial treaties by which British colonies are compelled to admit the produce of Belgium and the German Zollverein upon the same terms as they receive the produce of the United Kingdom. These treaties were made in 1862 and 1865 respectively and, by virtue of the latter agreement, *all British possessions* now enjoy the benefit of "most favored nation" treatment, not only in the German markets, but also in those of Italy, Switzerland, and Austria, these countries, with the German Empire, having a total population of 124,000,000. Each of these treaties was no doubt formally ratified by the imperial legislature soon after it had been officially signed.

Being unable to consult Hertslet's "Commercial Treaties" for 1862 and 1865, I am not in a position to state whether the legis-

*Mr. Hopkins writes (p. 592): "Sir Thomas MacIlwraith, a member of the Queensland University and three times premier of that colony (*sic*). . . ." Sir Thomas was premier of Queensland from 1879 to 1883, and again held that office for a short time in 1888. Although he has since been a cabinet minister, I find no record of his third premiership.

lature of the United Kingdom could grant to Canada and Australasia the power to discriminate in favor of each other, without violating the terms of the Anglo-Belgian and Anglo-Zollverein compacts.

A long-established principle of international law prevents the "denunciation" of treaties by sections or clauses, consequently they cannot be abrogated as far as certain colonies are concerned, and yet stand in reference to the mother country.

The retention of these international compacts is not a mere caprice upon the part of the home government, but is a portion of a thoroughly considered policy, as was fully explained by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, a member of the Salisbury government, in the House of Lords on or about May 27, 1892.

Returning to Mr. Hopkins' article, we find, also on page 601, these words: "If, however, the United States is to be excluded from sharing in these tariff adjustments, a *repeal of the imperial regulation referred to** will have to be obtained . . ." Mr. Hopkins had not previously referred to any "imperial regulation," but to an "imperial statute." Such looseness of language upon the part of one who professes to have a knowledge of constitutional questions is most reprehensible; it causes embarrassment to readers of all grades of knowledge.

The words "statute" and "act" are used synonymously to mean a bill which has passed both houses of a legislature and has received the royal or presidential assent. The word "law" is sometimes used with the same meaning, especially when it is preceded by a descriptive adjective. The word "regulation" may mean simply an order-in-council; or it may signify some constitutional principle.

A law, statute, or act, may be repealed, that is, revoked by a subsequent act. But a constitutional principle, taking the form of a privilege retained by the mother country, and not conferred upon its dependencies, cannot be *repealed* by statute, because there is nothing on the statute book to repeal. What is necessary to nullify the influence of such a constitutional principle, is a substantive act of Parliament.

* The italics are mine.

In the event of the home government agreeing to the creation of a species of Zollverein between Canada and Australasia, the mere repeal of certain clauses of a number of statutes which forbid discriminative tariffs upon the part of colonies would be quite insufficient; a special act, somewhat similar to the Australian Colonial Duties Act of 1873, would be requisite.

Now what are the prospects of imperial legislation permitting the formation of a customs union between Canada and Australasia?

In 1891 the Dominion sent a petition to England requesting the termination of such treaties as prohibited discriminative tariffs upon the part of Canada. This petition conveyed the impression that a desire existed in British North America to place imports from the United Kingdom upon better terms than those coming from foreign countries.

And what reply was received? Let Lord Knutsford, the colonial secretary of the Conservative government, speak for himself. His dispatch is dated April 2, 1892:

. . . . In so far as the right here claimed consists in fixing rates of customs duties applying equally to all foreign countries, the mother country, and the British colonies, Her Majesty's government does not contest the statement. But if the statement is to be taken as extending to a claim of right to establish discriminating treaties between different foreign nations, or against the mother country, or in favor of particular colonies, Her Majesty's government is obliged to point out that the claim is stated too broadly, for no such general right has hitherto been recognized, nor is it clear that it would be admitted by foreign countries. . . . I have to point out that the denunciation of these two treaties (Anglo-Belgian and Anglo-Zollverein) would not of itself confer upon the Dominion the freedom in fiscal matters which it desires to obtain, and I am disposed to doubt whether the extensive changes that would have to be made had been fully realized in putting forward this proposal. In order, therefore, to confer upon the Dominion complete freedom in its negotiation with foreign powers it would be necessary to revise very extensively the existing commercial treaties of the British Empire, and a great break-up of existing commercial relations of which Canada now enjoys the benefit is involved in the suggestion.

Such was the crushing reply to the petition sent to the colonial secretary at the suggestion of the loyal Canadian government. And let it be remembered that an impression was given, al-

though there was no actual statement in so many words, that discrimination in favor of the mother country might form a part of some future Canadian tariff law, provided the desired treaty "denunciation" and imperial legislation could be obtained.

According to Mr. Hopkins, the fiscal federationists have now enlarged their demand; they have probably discovered that Great Britain does not intend to change her tariff policy for the special advantage of the colonies, and they now ask for power to enable Canada and Australasia to discriminate *against* the mother country.

In the face of the emphatic utterances in both imperial houses only two years since, when arrangements not in themselves detrimental to the United Kingdom, although they involved changes in her relations with foreign countries which certainly would have been, were requested by Canada, it seems unreasonable to suppose that discrimination, which might in some slight degree be injurious to Great Britain's trade, would be granted. Moreover, the fact that Australia could have "protected" herself against the world more than twenty years since and has not done so, must lead unbiased onlookers to the conclusion that nothing approaching unanimity prevails among the inhabitants of Australasia as far as fiscal questions are concerned.

Mr. Hopkins is no doubt a very young man; he may live to see the Australian continent united in one colony, or he may even see a federated Australasia. At present both schemes seem distant, the mother colony, New South Wales, being as yet unrepresented in that "pleasant little Parliament," the Federal Council, and New Zealand being emphatically opposed to any federal proposal, except a federation of the whole British Empire. Upon the other hand, there are men of capacity and experience who anticipate changes of a different character; they expect to see the continent under one federal republican government, named "The United States of Australia."

Mr. Hopkins' summarized program has little prospect of success as far as Clause 1—the customs union between Austral-

asia and Canada—is concerned. Clause 5, the fast* steamship line between Halifax and Liverpool (why not Milford Haven?) appears to have still less chance of being adopted at present, seeing that many of the New York lines pay very small dividends or none at all. The Guion line has very recently ceased to exist and the American company is reported to have given a "blanket" mortgage of six million dollars in order to pay for its two new ships.

It is a curious circumstance that the last article published in THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS upon a subject connected with Canada contained some errors upon matters of fact, which were corrected in a subsequent number. It would be interesting to know whether this coincidence is due to something in the Canadian air, assuming that both writers reside in the Dominion, or whether these unpardonable errors are caused by the fact that some persons spend all their time in writing, *currente calamo*, and none of it in reading.

GEORGE L. MYERS.

* By "fast" I mean steamers equal in speed to the *Campania*, *Majestic*, or *Paris*. I do not doubt the possibility of establishing by government subsidy a line possessing ships somewhat larger, and perhaps slightly faster, than the Dominion liner *Labrador*.

THE OUTLOOK.

[Notes and comments concerning affairs of interest to intelligent and patriotic citizens. Address communications for this department to Outlook Department, American Journal of Politics, 114 Nassau Street, New York City.]

TENEMENT HOUSES IN NEW YORK.—New York's tenement-house census, just completed, shows 39,138 tenement houses in the city's twenty-four wards. Of this number 2,346 are what are called rear houses, in which live 56,130 people, including 8,784 children, who know little sunlight or air. In the twentieth ward the tenement population is 80,499. In the twelfth ward are 29,842 children under five years. One of the recommendations of the tenement-house commission calls for fireproof construction of all houses holding six families.

RESTRICTING IMMIGRATION.—The conviction in many thoughtful minds that further restrictions of immigration are imperative for the safety as well as the prosperity of the country has gained much strength by reason of the insurrection which has just ended. It is said that seventy per cent of those who are connected with strikes and other revolutionary movements in this country are persons not born in the United States. The Huns and Poles who threatened the destruction of Chicago and rose against the state of Illinois are more dangerous to the working population of which they claim to be a part than to any other classes. If the country cannot be relieved of these elements of national peril, it may at least protect itself against their further reinforcement from abroad. Laws which have allowed the entrance of fourteen per cent of immigrants who cannot read or write, and which have turned back only 1,630 out of 440,000, are altogether too loose for safety. An organization is being formed, with headquarters in Boston, to promote intelligence on this subject and to secure more adequate legislation for the healthy restriction of immigration. It is to be known as the Immigration Restriction League. It is non-partisan and the number of prominent men already connected with it will secure for it wide attention. Among them are Robert Treat Paine, Gen. Francis A. Walker, Prof. N. S. Shaler, Dr. E. E. Hale, with others of equal fame in New England and many in other states. Its aims are set forth in the following extract from its constitution :

"The objects of the league are to work for and advocate the further judicious restriction or stricter regulation of immigration. It will issue documents and circulars, solicit facts and information on the subject, hold public meetings, and in every way try to stir up public opin-

ion to the necessity of some action. It is not an object of this league to advocate the total exclusion of immigrants nor to debar the entrance of laborers or other persons of such character and standards as fit them to become citizens."

STATISTICS OF IMMIGRATION.—The following statistics, collated from an official report recently submitted to Congress, afford significant information as to the increase, decrease, and drift of foreign immigration for the last three years.

	1891.	1892.	Increase or decrease.	1893.	Increase or decrease.
Alabama	382	409	27, Increase.	320	89, Decrease.
Alaska	13	4	9, Decrease.	3	1, "
Arizona	110	225	125, Increase.	94	31, "
Arkansas	220	442	222, "	415	27, "
Connecticut	6,870	8,642	1,772, "	9,512	870, Increase.
Colorado	3,875	2,018	1,857, Decrease.	2,327	209, "
California	11,564	10,936	628, "	7,638	3,298, Decrease.
Dakota Territory	3,967				
Delaware	1,348	754	594, "	647	107, "
District of Columbia	627	861	234, Increase.	616	245, "
Florida	2,820	4,829	2,009, "	2,765	2,064, "
Georgia	262	390	128, "	272	118, "
Indiana	2,636	3,407	771, "	2,755	652, "
Indian Territory	187	314	127, "	260	54, "
Illinois	34,520	46,012	11,492, "	45,686	326, "
Iowa	7,658	8,066	408, "	6,369	1,697, "
Idaho	269	343	74, "	221	122, "
Kentucky	759	1,046	287, "	710	336, "
Kansas	2,346	4,062	1,716, "	3,409	653, "
Louisiana	2,600	4,062	1,462, "	3,409	653, "
Maine	844	1,111	267, "	1,095	16, "
Maryland	3,061	7,286	4,225, "	4,736	3,061, "
Michigan	13,420	14,630	1,210, "	10,569	4,061, "
Missouri	5,402	5,544	142, "	4,378	1,166, "
Minnesota	9,368	12,740	3,372, "	11,687	1,053, "
Mississippi	236	349	113, "	205	144, "
Montana	847	1,244	397, "	1,068	176, "
Massachusetts	34,045	39,987	5,942, "	35,531	4,456, "
New Hampshire	648	1,215	567, "	1,152	63, "
North Carolina	91	331	240, "	289	42, "
North Dakota		2,525	147,*	2,336	189, "
Nebraska	5,430	5,768	338, Increase.	3,974	1,794, "
Nevada	226	626	400, "	320	306, "
New Jersey	15,532	16,605	833, "	15,150	1,515, "
New Mexico	146	340	194, "	237	103, "
New York	135,766	242,689	106,923, "	161,047	81,642, "
Ohio	15,233	15,040	193, Decrease.	13,127	1,913, "
Oregon	1,158	1,192	34, Increase.	1,002	190, "
Oklahoma		6	6, "	2	4, "
Pennsylvania	71,697	83,414	11,717, "	57,083	26,331, "
Rhode Island	3,879	4,385	506, "	4,931	546, Increase.
South Carolina	171	231	60, "	221	10, Decrease.
South Dakota		1,666	77,*	2,533	867, Increase.
Tennessee	496	551	55, Increase.	423	128, Decrease.
Texas	3,599	3,007	592, Decrease.	2,574	523, "
Utah	1,623	611	1,012, "	415	196, "
Vermont	469	759	290, Increase.	646	113, "
Virginia	319	502	183, "	583	85, Increase.
West Virginia	544	985	441, "	987	2, "
Wisconsin	10,496	16,066	5,570, "	12,034	4,032, Decrease.
Washington	1,207	1,286	79, "	816	470, "
Wyoming	849	571	278, Decrease.	405	60, "
TOTALS	420,135	579,134		438,984	

* Proportionate increase from territorial figures of 1891.

CENTURY PAPERS ON CIVICS.—Charles Dudley Warner is the author of a most interesting paper in the July number of *The Century*

on "The Attack on the Senate," in which he presents these among other conclusions: "If what is alleged against the character of the senators were true, the deterioration would not be due to the form of our government, but to our general false materialistic conception of life. And the character of the senators will be raised by the appreciation of the dignity and importance of the individual states, as it will be lowered by a degradation of the states." He further says (and here he points to the influences by which the question of "degradation" is determined): "A great nation is made only by worthy citizens. . . . If the Senate at any time lacks ability and integrity, that is because the states choose to send their inferior and untrustworthy men. The voters alone are to blame. No good government can exist with ignorant and corrupt voters."

Albert Shaw, editor of *The Review of Reviews* and a member of the Institute of Civics, in the same number of *The Century*, presents an article of equal interest and value on "What German Cities do for their Citizens." It may be news to most American readers that "in the conception of a German city government there are no limits whatever to the municipal functions," and that each is at liberty "to promote in every feasible way its own welfare and the welfare of its citizens." The German city holds itself responsible for the education, provisions for amusements and recreation, health, moral interests, promotion of thrift, and general well-being of all. Burgomasters are virtually life incumbents, as are also their chief associates in authority. Abrupt and capricious changes in policy are not to be feared. Stable conditions are assured, with steady progress in the realization of ideals, with an economy and generous foresight "such as no other nation has ever exhibited." Water supplies, sanitary conditions, lighting, street cleaning, education, poor relief, all these are brought to a state of perfection possible only under conditions which do not permit the periodical overturning of municipal affairs by greedy and scheming politicians.

HARVARD CASTS OUT BACCHUS.—At Harvard's late commencement, an order was issued that no punches nor spirituous liquors of any kind should be used at the banquets, class dinners, and other festivities held under the auspices of the college. The results, according to the daily papers, were seen in an entire absence of "the bacchanalian revels" which have been one of the features of commencements at Harvard and other colleges. The change is notable in more ways than one. It shows that the growth of rational temperance sentiment is beginning to affect even our higher seats of learning, where great scorn is usually affected towards anything that savors of fanaticism. Harvard has set the example here which every American institution of learning ought to follow.—*Christian at Work*.

THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.—Archbishop Ireland, in a recent address before the Minnesota Total Abstinence Association, said: "We

thought we meant business years ago in this warfare against drink, but I hope God will forgive us for our weakness, for we went into the battle-field without sufficient resolution. We labored under the fatal mistake that we could argue out the question with the liquor sellers. We imagined there was some power in moral suasion; that when we should show them the evil of their ways they would abandon the traffic. We have seen there is no hope of improving in any shape or form the liquor traffic. There is nothing now to be done but to wipe it out completely."

CHICAGO CIVICS CLUB.—Under this title, the Institute's Chicago members have effected an organization which gives promise of great usefulness. A meeting preliminary to organization was held at the Union League Club, in February, at which addresses were made by President Waite of the Institute, Judge John W. Cary, Judge Henry M. Shepard, Rev. Dr. J. G. Johnson, W. A. Giles, Edward M. Winston, F. W. Parker, Judge Luther M. Shreve, Col. H. P. Davidson, Dr. Ira W. Allen, Col. P. T. Townley, and others. At subsequent meetings the organization was completed. The present officers are Judge E. B. Sherman, LL.D., president, Rev. O. E. Murray, D.D., vice-president, and E. M. Winston, secretary. Among the Institute's members in Chicago are: George E. Adams, Ferd W. Peck, Thomas B. Bryan, Judge Henry M. Shepard, the Rt. Rev. Charles E. Cheney, Prof. David Swing, the Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, L. Z. Leiter, Col. F. W. Parker, John W. Cary, the Hon. E. B. Sherman, the Rev. George D. Shepard, Prof. Albert G. Lane, Cyrus H. McCormick, Prof. George W. Hough, Prof. J. J. Halsey, Daniel Goodwin, the Rev. J. G. Johnson, D.D., Dr. Ira W. Allen, Lewis H. Bisbee, Willard T. Block, E. W. Bemis, Ph.D., Maj. A. L. Cheney, Dr. Isaac N. Danforth, Col. H. P. Davidson, C. N. Fay, William H. French, Dr. Malcolm Gunn, Franklin Hathaway, Hiram Holmes, Charles S. Harmon, Willis G. Jackson, Prof. Alfred Kirk, Eugene C. Long, George E. Newcomb, Oliver W. Norton, Dr. Selim H. Peabody, Homer E. Sargent, D. Henry Sheldon, Luther M. Shreve, P. T. Townley, and Edward M. Winston.

PATRIOTISM NOT A LOST VIRTUE.—In a report of a meeting of the Chicago councilors of the Institute of Civics, published in the *Times* of that city, we find the following:

"The work of the Institute has been carried on solely by the voluntary coöperation of good citizens and the faithful services of unpaid officers. It has thus furnished *in itself* an object lesson in the manifestation of the qualities in citizenship which it seeks to inspire. When men of suitable abilities, in the midst of the demands of their various callings, are willing to assume the onerous burden of official direction in so large a work as this without pecuniary compensation, and more than two thousand busy citizens of the highest standing in localities throughout the country are willing, as 'councilors,' to

coöperate through voluntary labors and contributions, the most pessimistic may be encouraged to believe that true patriotism is not a lost virtue."

It is true that the Institute's officers are devoting to it valuable time in the manner stated; and this fact should assure for them the full measure of material support requisite for the proper conduct of the great work intrusted to their direction.

EXEMPLARS IN CITIZENSHIP.—Hon. Justin S. Morrill, the senior member of the United States Senate in years as well as length of service, has entered upon his eighty-fourth year. Erect of form, firm of step, and bright of eye, at the end of his forty years of congressional service, twelve in the House, and twenty-eight in the Senate, he is still, as he has always been, an example to his colleagues in his constant attendance upon legislative sessions and his patriotic devotion to the highest ideals of duty. He, with Hon. William Strong, who is a little younger and equally vigorous in mind and body, are the senior members of the Institute of Civics' Board of Trustees. After twenty years of continuous and distinguished service on the bench of the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Strong is actively employed as counsel in important legal affairs, and in philanthropic services. He has long been president of the American Tract Society, and, since the death of Chief Justice Waite, his predecessor in that office, he has but once (when traveling) failed to occupy his place as president of the Institute's Board of Trustees at its annual meetings at Washington. Another member of the Institute, of about the same age, proudly named by the people of his own state as the "first citizen of Massachusetts," is Hon. Robert C. Winthrop of Boston, whose services in all good causes have brought a crown of honor for his vigorous old age. Henry Barnard, the Nestor among great American educators, older than any of them, is another of its interested members. To be associated in the work of an institution which commands the sympathy and support of such citizens, and has had the coöperation of Mark Hopkins, Theodore T. Woolsey, Noah Porter, F. A. P. Barnard, and like men of honored memory, ought to be an inspiration to high endeavor for all its members.

EXTENSION DEPARTMENT A. I. C.—To arouse a patriotic interest in civics is almost useless unless such interest be supplemented and made potent by an intelligent understanding of the questions of the day. To place such knowledge within reach of all citizens is the problem now confronting the Extension Department. The Department of Popular Work has until recently labored under the disadvantage of having no adequate arrangements for reaching the people at large. With the reorganization of the department and the fusion with it of an association of high standing, plans have been devised by which this result is possible. In the spring of 1894, under the name of the Current Topic Association, a definite original scheme for the systematic

study of current topics was introduced into many public and private schools of the country. Clubs were formed among business men, in one instance the mayor of the town taking a prominent part in the work. The plan was strongly recommended by more than fifty of the foremost public men and educators in the country, including Senators Morgan and Sherman, Hon. J. Sterling Morton, Hon. Theo. Roosevelt, Hon. Carroll D. Wright, U. S. Commissioner of Labor, Henry Randall Waite, President A. I. C., Dr. William T. Harris, U. S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. J. C. Mackenzie of Lawrenceville School, Hon. Seth Low, and Cyrus Northrop, President University of Minnesota. School officials introduced it into the curriculum, and the state of New York made use of it in teachers' institutes and training classes. The fact was apparent from the first that the people had been waiting for just such a plan. Success was assured, and by the beginning of summer the number of clubs had grown beyond all expectation. As the result, a stronger organization has become necessary, and the work inaugurated by this association will in the future be conducted under the auspices of the Extension Department of the American Institute of Civics. Mr. Hughes DeC. Slater, who is the successor of the late Col. Geo. T. Balch of the New York City Board of Education, as the director of the department, was the originator of the Current Topic Association, and is admirably fitted to further the aims of the Institute along this particular line.

The work of this department will be principally carried on through clubs organized all over the country. The purpose of these clubs will be to promote a more intelligent understanding of civic duty and a more virile patriotism, by a systematic, careful study of current events, especially by an intelligent reading of newspapers and periodicals. The details for the organization and conduct of clubs have been carefully worked out and are now ready for publication. The original scheme has been improved in many particulars, a number of useful hints have been gained from the experience of the clubs already formed, and the facts thus obtained are embodied in the new plan.

An important feature of the department is its corps of lecturers, numbering upwards of two hundred twenty-five citizens, all exceptionally qualified for useful service through the delivery of addresses before lyceums, secular and religious associations of young people, teachers' institutes, and other educational assemblies, religious meetings, workingmen's societies, Law and Order Societies, Municipal Leagues, Good Government Clubs, and other civic associations, and especially before the various organizations related to the Institute as auxiliaries.

The scope and adaptability of the plan are clearly shown by the broad field covered in its past success, and the coöperation of every councilor of the Institute in this practical work is heartily desired. Through the agency of these clubs the patriotic purpose and noble aims of the Institute will be made known to many thousands who would be accessible in perhaps no other way. Such direct and com-

prehensive efforts for the accomplishment of the objects of the Institute surely merit the interest and assistance of every one of its members.

Correspondence with the department is invited, and further information as to the details of the plan will be gladly furnished. Address Extension Department A. I. C., Box 348, Washington, D. C.

A BIMETALLIC CURRENCY AND A GOLD BASIS.—Money should, of all things, be stable in its value, as it is used as the measure of most other values. It should be in the most convenient form for transporting and counting.

The prerogative of issuing money should be confined strictly to the government. This prerogative is a source of profit, and in no other way can this profit inure to the benefit of the whole people, except through lessened taxes, more public works, etc., etc.

The use of coin, or token money, is a relic of barbarism, and the continual coining, counting and recounting, shipping and reshipping, of large quantities of "specie" is a folly and a waste unworthy of our present civilization.

Let the government purchase any or all silver bullion mined in the United States, when offered at the market price of such bullion in the markets of the world; *provided*, that it can secure at the same time a like value of gold bullion (mined anywhere) at the market price of such bullion in the markets of the world.

Then let the government issue treasury notes (legal tender) on this bullion, redeemable, on demand, half in gold and half in silver bullion; and as a continual reserve of fifty per cent with which to meet outstanding liabilities is considered good banking, the government would issue two for one, and store the bullion away inviolate, excepting as a redemption fund for these treasury notes.

The first note thus issued would determine the basis for all time; for instance, the first two dollar note would be redeemable in as much gold bullion as a gold dollar will buy (say twenty-six grains) and also as much silver bullion as a gold dollar would buy in the markets of the world, on the date when the note is presented for redemption.

The number of grains of gold to the dollar would remain fixed, while the number of grains of silver might vary; the government would simply guarantee against a decline in silver, which it could afford to do, and an advance in silver would be an additional profit.

Of course, no small amounts would be presented for redemption; and in fact, when the public are certain that the currency they hold can be redeemed at pleasure, in tangible values, they do not care to redeem it.

The amount of gold bullion that could be secured would be the only limit to the issue, and the issue would be continuous. All purchases of bullion, of course, would be paid for in treasury notes. The only coin used should be a plentiful supply of silver halves, quarters, dimes, and nickels for small change. Then when the other nations of the world come to their senses and fix a "ratio," we can adopt it at a minute's

notice, without disturbing our system in the least. The production of gold and silver in the United States for the year 1894 will probably be nearly equal in value. Should it be necessary at any time to strengthen the reserve, purchase more bullion and issue only one for one.—*Abbott Lawrence Arnold.*

LETTERS FROM CITIZENS.—Increasing numbers of citizens manifest in appreciative letters their interest in the purposes of the Institute of Civics. Many of these present suggestions and statements of general interest, and all of them afford inspiration to more earnest efforts. One of the most accomplished and successful educators of her sex, Mrs. Sylvanus G. Reed, of New York, says :

"The objects of this organization have always had my deepest sympathy and interest. Virtue, honesty, and education must be the citadel of a republic. In the character of the people lies the conservation of national honor. The source and springs of that character must be kept pure and free from taint. We have taken into citizenship multitudes of an alien and servile race incapable of appreciating the duties and privileges thrust upon them. We have not only to guard against venality and other indigenous sins which threaten the body politic, but to rescue our republic from impending disaster from without, more frightful than if the united navies of the world were approaching our shores with hostile intent. Far more dangerous than disciplined soldiers are the hordes of all nations which are borne to us by every ship entering our ports, and adopted into the rights and privileges of citizenship with no qualifications, no knowledge of our institutions, and not even the probation of time which our sons must endure. Political parties caress and cajole them for the sake of their votes, which often determine vital questions, stay the progress of reform, and impede the patriotic progress of wise and good men. One who thinks must tremble in view of the power thus infused into our social and political life. Some of our foreign ministers and consuls could give details which it would be well for our institution to consider. It takes a long residence, good character, and the possession of \$700 to qualify for citizenship in the little republic of Switzerland. To bear the title of an American citizen should be an honor and an aim worthy the highest ambition. It is our birthright, purchased with the sacrifices and blood of those whose memories were revered. Should we longer cast this pearl before swine who trample it in the mire and then turn and rend us?"

From other recent letters we quote as follows :

"I have in charge a very interesting class in political science and civil government and we are also doing some work in international law; and I am much gratified to be connected with an institution that will give me aid in this direction."—*B. D. Cockrill, President Trinity University, Tehuacana, Texas.*—"I wish to encourage our students to compete for the prizes which the A. I. C. offers to college students."—*Joseph French Johnson, Professor Wharton School of Finance,*

University of Pennsylvania.—"I heartily indorse the movement which the Institute is making toward correcting public evils and preparing our youths and children to become true American citizens."—*E. Brigham, Trinidad, Colorado.*—"I stand ready to contribute to its needs with pen as well as voice, whenever called upon. I am in the deepest sympathy with the effort to advance the teaching of civics. I contend that the modern humanities will supplant both the classic and physical sciences as the characteristic feature of the coming education."—*Daniel Fulcomer, Lecturer in Social Science, University of Chicago.*—"We are in hearty sympathy with your purposes, an indication of which may be found in the formation by our students of a Citizenship Club, the purpose of which is to bring them into closer touch with the thought of the time, and especially to cultivate among them those things by which they may be able to exercise the better in the future their duties as citizens."—*W. O. Atwater (Associate Member Faculty A. I. C.), Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.*—"I very gladly approve of the forward movement (of the Institute) in connection with THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS. This movement is of necessity educational, requiring an organ to voice untrammelled the truth."—*Rev. H. T. McEwen, Ph.D., New York City.*—"My prayers and sympathies are with you in this work. May God bless you in your efforts to hasten the time when we shall in truth be the 'happy people whose God is the Lord.'"—(*Hon.*) *Noah Granger, Randolph, Vermont.*—"Shall spend the next year in New York City as a fellow in sociology and am counting on being of more service to the Institute than I have been in the past."—*John F. Crowell, Late President Trinity College, North Carolina.*—"I heartily agree with the objects of the A. I. C. Please enroll my name."—*Rev. Charles H. Eaton, D.D., New York City.*—"The teaching of civics falls to me in our institution and I feel fairly sure of time during the present year to be devoted to the purpose of the Institute."—*Dr. John Hull, President State Normal School, Beaver Falls, Wis.*—"A hundred thousand of the best men in the land ought to have the benefit of their perusal" (Institute publications).—*W. C. Rowley, Utica, N. Y.*—"I am glad to see that you have cause for encouragement and can feel that your work is appreciated. All who have the advantage of knowing something of the unselfish efforts of the trustees, managers, and writers ought to feel grateful to them."—*Levi Knowles, Philadelphia, Pa.*—"I am in hearty sympathy with your efforts—especially in the department of public school work. I have urged upon teachers the importance of instruction along this line. I shall be pleased to do anything I can in this vicinity in the interests of good citizenship and education for higher standards in this respect."—*A. Worth Palmer, School Commissioner, Fairport, N. Y.*—"Heartily approving the objects of the A. I. C., I take pleasure in forwarding my acceptance of the position of councilor."—*Lewis G. Janes, Ph.D., Secretary Department of Political Science, Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences.*—"I take pleasure in subscribing my name to the inclosed (acceptance

of membership) because of the great sympathy I have with the work of the Institute."—*John T. Wilds, D.D., Pastor Seventh Presbyterian Church, New York City.*—"I hope I may be able to coöperate with the A. I. C., and trust you will feel free to call upon me any time when you need my services."—*Clinton Rogers Woodruff, Philadelphia, Pa., Secretary National Municipal League.*—"The cause is one which enlists my hearty sympathy. In a modest way, among the 1,200 boys and girls under my charge, I have tried to disseminate sound views concerning our civic institutions."—*S. S. Parr, Superintendent of Schools, St. Cloud, Minn.*

GOOD CITY GOVERNMENT.—No more important publication bearing specifically on this subject has appeared in recent times, if ever, than the volume containing the proceedings of the National Conference for Good City Government, which met in Philadelphia in January, 1894. The admirable program of this conference evidenced wise forethought, and the result is here presented in valuable papers and discussions relating to (1) the present condition of affairs in our larger cities; (2) the possible standard to which cities can attain; (3) the methods whereby can be evolved from the present conditions the highest municipal advancement.

The chief papers were presented by such able speakers and writers as Moorfield Story, William G. Low, Franklin McVeagh, Charles J. Bonaparte, George Gluyas Mercer, Edmund Kelly, Leo S. Rowe, Carl Schurz, Mrs. Mary E. Mumford, W. Harris Roome, Washington Gladden, D.D., Edwin D. Mead, J. H. Ecob, D.D., Alfred Bishop Mason, W. S. Rainsford, D.D., and Charles Richardson.

All evidence painstaking effort to contribute something really useful to the elucidation of problems whose serious character the speakers fully recognized: The value of this volume is greatly increased by the addition of historical notes concerning all existing municipal reform organizations in the United States, and a subject index of books, pamphlets, and periodicals containing matter of value relating to municipal reform. The edition of this most useful publication is limited, and those desiring copies should at once remit the price, \$1.50, to Mr. C. R. Woodruff, 514 Walnut Street, Philadelphia.

Among members of the A. I. C. whose names appear among those actively interested in this Good Government Conference are Richard H. Dana, Gamaliel Bradford, Lyman Abbott, Richard T. Ely, Edward Everett Hale, Samuel B. Capen, W. S. Rainsford, D.D., W. D. Foulke, Horace E. Deming, Albert Shaw, L. A. Maynard, W. S. Logan, F. W. Holls, W. S. Ufford, Prof. George G. Wilson, Prof. J. W. Jenckes, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, and Henry Randall Waite, representing various cities; and Clinton Rogers Woodruff, secretary of the conference and compositor of this volume, George Gluyas Mercer, Charles A. Brinley, J. Levering Jones, Hampton E. Carson, James MacAllister, J. G. Rosengarter, Talcott Williams, and Philip C. Garrett, of Philadelphia.

THE LATE HON. RUFUS S. FROST.—One of the friends of the late Hon. Rufus S. Frost of Boston, Mass., one of the original members of the A. I. C., sends a paragraph which appeared in a Boston journal at the time of his death: "A few days ago the 'stars and stripes' hung at half-mast over the parochial school building in our city. A call of inquiry at the Catholic parsonage resulted in this answer: 'This is the least we can do for so good a man as the late Hon. Rufus S. Frost.' Such a testimony indicates the acquirement of Christ-like charity. . . . Our most honored citizen left by his life a practical definition of the meaning of 'all ye are brethren.'"

The writer then shows Mr. Frost in his various relations to his fellow-men—as a man of the most winning Christian courtesy and toleration, as a philanthropist of the most sensitive modesty, the finest generosity, as a Christian of intense spiritual buoyancy, the most tender spirituality and loyalty, and he could have added, as an ideal citizen.

CIVIL DAMAGE ACT.—In *Johnson vs. Johnson*, just decided by the Supreme Court of Michigan, the court—all the justices concurring—holds that a wife who has notified saloon keepers not to sell intoxicating liquors to her husband, can recover damages for injury to her means of support from one who sold her husband liquor during the first two days of an eighteen days' debauch, notwithstanding the fact that other sellers furnished him with liquor during the other days. This is a righteous judgment, and will help to bring responsibility for human life-wrecking directly home to those who make this their business. It is to be hoped that the decision will be repeated in the interests of families in many states.

PARTY BEFORE COUNTRY.—A senator in Congress recently made this declaration in a speech to the body: "No matter at what sacrifice to state interests, the paramount duty of every ——— was to keep the party in power." We omit the party designation because we do not write as a partisan, and it will do to insert either party name in the blank. The sentence expresses the thorough party spirit, the spirit in which mere politicians act, though we have never before seen it expressed in such a shameful manner. Party before country! Sacrifice the interests of the country, but save the party and control the offices and the revenues! And yet it permeates the party organizations, and no man can be sustained by a party who will not yield to it. The church, too, is in danger from a similar party spirit.—*Presbyterian Journal*.

WOMEN IN COLLEGES.—In a recent article, Jeanette F. Walworth, member A. I. C., says: "A year or two ago a computation was made touching the number and relative prosperity of some of the great colleges for women now dotting every hillside in the country from sea to sea. The computation showed that 60,000 women were receiving in-

struction of the highest description in such institutions as Vassar, Bryn Mawr, Smith, Wellesley, and some lesser educational centers. Ten thousand of this number were in colleges appropriated exclusively to the women. The other 50,000 were in colleges devoted to one curriculum for men and women alike." Here are 60,000 individuals who will have grand opportunities for the exercise of power as citizens, if not as voters. What efforts are being made in the colleges which they attend to especially qualify them for service in the cause of good citizenship? While suffrage for women waits to be realized, we earnestly invite its advocates to coöperate with the Institute of Civics in promoting the special instruction which shall most fully equip this noble army of citizens for civic usefulness.

YOUNG CHRISTIANS AND GOOD CITIZENSHIP.—Upon the heels of the Cleveland Convention, says *The Presbyterian*, comes a movement in Pittsburg to organize the young people of all Christian denominations into a society to secure the better enforcement of laws. The object of the movement will be best understood from a paper that has been drawn up and circulated in the form of a pledge, something as follows :

"We, whose names are undersigned, agree to stand by each other with moral and financial aid in the maintenance of good order and government for the highest possible welfare of the community at large. We favor and propose to secure the maintenance and enforcement of laws against Sunday liquor selling with all its attendant evils, and laws against Sunday theatricals and excursions, and all forms of Sunday traffic and labor that rob employees of their right to a day of rest, and that prove, in fact, an unjust and injurious competition to law-abiding citizens, and a temptation to many to become law-breakers like their unfair competitors. We also propose to secure the enforcement of all other good laws against such evils as obscene publications, disreputable houses, and whatever else is ensnaring and demoralizing to our youth, or degrading and corrupting to any part of our community."

It is not the purpose of this society to interfere in any way with the regular officers of the law, but rather to assist those who are disposed to do their duty, and to seek the removal of those who are in sympathy with lawlessness. It will seek also to enlist in this work upon these broad Christian principles all who love law and order, both Protestant and Catholic.

This and like laudable organizations are among the hopeful signs of the times. Largest efficiency for such undertakings will follow provisions for the serious study of the things that make for good citizenship from the caucus to the polls, and beyond these, in the administration of public affairs. In this, valuable aid will be extended to all such societies through the Extension Department of the A. I. C., which is referred to elsewhere.

PATRIOTISM OF ROMANISTS.—The Hon. Bourke Cochran, member

of Congress from New York City, made an address at the recent opening of a Catholic school exhibit in that city, in which he warmly defended the loyalty of Catholics to the republic. In the course of his speech he is said to have turned to Archbishop Corrigan, and with impassioned utterance declared that he would accept the teachings of the church from His Grace with the utmost reverence as befitted a son of the church. "But if the day should ever come"—and here his voice rose until it echoed through the big hall, making the rafters ring—"but if the day should ever come when from a Catholic pulpit you utter one word hostile to the integrity of this government, I tell you that if such language falls from your lips it will be heretical. You will be false to the republic and false to the church that placed the consecrated oil upon your hands for the blessing of its children." A great burst of applause greeted these words, and no one took exceptions to them.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.—In a recent address on Proportional Representation, Dr. John R. Commons, of the University of Indiana and member of the A. I. C., says: "The two most important problems before the New York Constitutional Convention are the gerrymander and city government. The central failure in city government is the legislative branch. Hence in both problems it is representative government itself which is on trial. The essential failure in representative government is found in the method of electing representatives by districts. This method was originated by our ancestors to settle the problem of federation, to unite sections under a central government. But to-day the problems are not sectional, but organic. Diverse interests are not territorial, but class interests, based on social and economic questions. Classes, political opinions, need representation more than sections. This is especially true of city government, where the ward system is irrational and results in the ward politician. Proportional representation consists, first, in abolishing the districts and electing representatives on a general ticket, then assigning to the different parties representatives in proportion to their numbers. In this way a majority is not necessary to elect, but every minority would be represented. The Republicans suffer most from the gerrymander; they would gain most by this reform. Furthermore, the party would not lose all representation when a split occurs, but each faction would get its share, and thus the party as a whole be correctly and fully represented."

In presenting the other advantages of the plan, Prof. Commons said that abler and more experienced men would be elected. Small factions could not hold the balance of power, bribery would be ineffective, and the men chosen would be the leaders of the people, instead of tools of the machine or the lobby. "The perfection of politics," he said, "will be secured when proportional voting is applied to primaries and conventions, for in this way the business and intelligent classes can get a showing, and thus be encouraged to attend their party primaries."

INFLUENCE OF CHURCH POLITICS ON GOVERNMENT.—A valued contemporary says that the influence in the United States of the Congregational polity in the churches upon civil government has never been fully recounted, while our democratic civil institutions are profoundly influencing the polity of the monarchical or hierarchical churches. If the statement is made, using the term "Congregational" in its widest sense, it will stand. But Congregationalism, pure and simple, is limited in its influence upon political life mostly to New England, where the town government is distinctively Congregational or Democratic, while in New York and the other states the form of local government is as distinctively Presbyterian or Republican. The "town-meeting" is peculiar to New England, and is not known outside that sextet of states. And here we may say we doubt if the statement so often made that civil government in this country took its pattern from either Presbyterianism or Congregationalism—and the claim is made for each—can be substantiated. The seeds of these governmental methods were to be found in the various charters of the colonies, which were modified from time to time.—*Christian at Work.*

RACE COURSE GAMBLING.—The sporting editor of the *New York Times* is authority for the statement that "racing is losing ground with influential men all over the world." He adds: "The jockey clubs in this country may make vast profits this year, and possibly a few years longer, but in England, France, Australia, and the United States, the number of influential people who are asking earnestly, 'Why should open gambling on horses upon a huge scale be allowed any more than gambling in big lotteries?' is growing larger every year."

CRYSTALLIZATION OF A GRAND IDEA.—In an editorial under the head of "Civics," the *Boston Traveler* says: "'Let me give the watchword to a cause, and I care not who frames its platform,' the saying might run. The ideas which have won in the world have been those which are capable of compression in some brief, quotable, shoutable, singable formula. 'Taxation without representation,' was the rallying cry of the revolutionary heroes. 'Ours for us,' is the neater motto of the Australian protectionists.

"A new word has been introduced into the vocabulary of current discussion which we should like to see popularized as the crystallization of a grand idea. It must be evident to any one who comprehends the fullness of human nature that political economy, a soulless science, cannot bring salvation to the race. Even the most perfect set of laws could never administer themselves. Until society is thoroughly penetrated with a moral ideal, it will continue to present the tragic contrasts of happiness and misery, over which archfiends and archangels, if such beings be, now respectively gloat and sigh.

"The American Institute of Civics is responsible for an admirable new word which expresses this long-felt need. A union of eminent citizens

to promote good citizenship, it is now in its ninth year, and includes in its membership Supreme Court judges, United States senators, and some of the most distinguished private personages in this country. Its watchword, 'Civics,' is defined by the present president as that 'body of knowledge, or science, which concerns itself with the interests and reciprocal relations of the citizens and the state.'

"Such a science is of vital interest to every man who possesses the privilege of the suffrage. Let the churches preach ethics, and the academies political economy. Some bridge between the two is needed, and civics, which is the ethics of political economy, seems to establish the connection worthily. Let us hear more of 'civics.'"

CITIZENSHIP REFUSED TO JAPANESE.—The decision by Judge Coit of the United States Circuit Court that a native of Japan, for many years a resident in Boston, where he is successful in business and intends to remain as a merchant, cannot become a citizen of the United States because he is a Mongolian, is one that doubtless is as legal as it is deplorable and evil. We cannot help feeling that the judiciary of the United States might be about more creditable business than refusing citizenship to the fellow-countrymen of Neesima simply because they are not of the Caucasian or African stock. Yet so long as demagogues shape our national immigration and naturalization legislation no other alternative is left to the courts. Possibly this verdict, like the Dred Scott decision, may prove to be a boomerang and hasten the day when the tests for residence and citizenship in this country shall be based on the intelligence—native or acquired, industry, and moral character of the *individual*, and not be settled by his place of birth or the merits of his race as a whole. That this decision has made the Japanese in this country righteously indignant is not strange. That it will not assuage the strained situation in Japan is also certain. It is gratifying to see the promptness and spirit which Congressman Everett of Massachusetts has shown in introducing a bill in the House which, if passed, will make the decision of Judge Coit void.—*The Congregationalist*.

TO TEACH CITIZENSHIP.—The *New York Tribune* editorially comments on a proposition from the Texas State Teachers' Association to the National Educational Association, that a course of instruction should embrace "not only a broader patriotism, but the rights and duties of citizenship, the rights of property, and the security and sacredness of human life," as follows:

"There is no more urgent public need to-day than that for clear thought and rational doctrines on the subjects of civil government, social order, and public and private rights. And there is no more appropriate place for supplying that need, at least to the workers and voters of a few years hence, than in the public schools. These schools are not charitable institutions for giving people instruction for their private good, for which they could not afford to pay. They are a

branch of the government, established and maintained, primarily, for the good of the state. And whatever they may do in the direction of making good mechanics, merchants, lawyers, or preachers, their first business is to make good citizens. The resolutions of these level-headed Texan teachers are most earnestly to be commended to the National Educational Association, and to every public school teacher and school board in the land."

CAMPAIGN FOR GOOD CITIZENSHIP.—Just now this country is being aroused as never before upon the general subject of good citizenship. The movement started at the last international convention of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, and has been spreading throughout the country, now in the Endeavor Society and now in the Young Men's Christian Association, until American citizens by the tens of thousands are studying the question of a good citizen's duty. Political parties are a-tremble, and professional politicians are aghast. . . . "Clean men and pure principles," is the war cry of those engaged in this campaign for good citizenship; and in it are Republicans, Democrats, Prohibitionists, Populists, and members of every other political party represented in this country, every man pledged to labor wholly within his own party, and there to demand that his party shall go before the country with a righteous platform and upright candidates, else that party shall suffer defeat at the hands of the moral voters in its own ranks. The moral element of this government can rule, and if it does not it is largely the fault of moral men themselves. He is no true patriot who does not labor from the primaries to the polls for good men for office. The apathetic voter, who stayed at home when the primary convention was held in his district, and who was too busy to go to the polls on election day, has no right to complain if the lawless and immoral element in his party, that element which is always on hand on such occasions, shall put bad men in the offices and bad planks in the party's platform. So the friends of good citizenship are pleading for good men, religious men, to unite their strength in the interest of good government. To do this the best men must engage in politics to the extent of their votes and their influence. It is idle to say that the politics of this country can be controlled by the saloon men and their friends in spite of the best that good men may do. That is to admit that God and the good do not constitute a majority. Whenever the might of right is exercised, the triumph of right will be announced through a purged civil government; and the demagogue, who is all things for office only, and the ward politician and his long line of evil companions, will be retired for regeneration. No man is here urged to abandon his party. No man is advised to join any political party. No political party is attacked, and none lauded. The sole purpose of this column is to insist that every voter who reads it shall do his earnest best to get his party to do right; and if he fails, then let him do right himself by scratching the unclean ticket and rebuking with his own honest ballot the dishonest

platform. The party lash should have no terrors for an upright citizen who has labored faithfully and vainly to induce his party to do its duty. The scoffs and scorn of the machine politician should not frighten a real man from the heroic resolve to scratch with holy hands the unholy ticket.—*Cumberland Presbyterian.*

THE NEED OF THE HOUR.—The *New York World* enforces the great importance of education in civics, in some serious and thoughtful words in connection with the newly appointed Labor Commission. "Its responsibility," it says, "will be very great and the results of its inquiry should be fruitful of good to all interests.

"But, as Mr. Carroll D. Wright pointed out in a *World* interview yesterday, its powers and functions are very narrowly restricted. It cannot even consider any question apart from the particular disturbance concerning which its appointment is called for. Its sole business is to inquire exhaustively about that, to report its conclusions as to the facts and their causes, and to make any suggestions it may deem wise concerning remedies for evils discovered.

"This is important work, but it does not by any means cover the whole of present governmental duty. The strike just ended is but one, though a conspicuous one, of many symptoms of popular unrest. Many calm thinkers regard these symptoms as indications of something radically wrong and defective in the industrial, economic, and social system under which we live.

"Part of this ignorance is due to the influx of naturalized foreigners, who now compose an important part of our working population and our citizenship as well. These aliens knew nothing of American law when they came, and our easy system of naturalization has not required them to learn anything about it since. But the ignorance does not stop at the line which divides the naturalized from the native citizen. There are thousands of men in whose veins not a drop of alien blood flows whose ideas of the American Constitution and the powers and limitations of the state and federal governments are of the haziest order. Some of these are intelligent enough to be newspaper editors, prosperous business men, teachers in our schools and colleges, clergymen in our pulpits—in short, many who essay to teach the public are themselves absolutely untaught in this important matter.

"The lesson of the disastrous strike which has just ended is, therefore, most obvious. There must be a revival of education in American citizenship. It is not consistent to denounce even riotous strikers for the folly of ignorance when no proper provision has been made for their education in the thing they most need to understand. Our whole educational system, from the common school to the highest university in the land, is at fault in this respect, and if the collapsed Debs boycott shall have the effect to work a necessary revolution in this matter, it will have proved a blessing in disguise, after all."

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS.

OCTOBER, 1894.

ANARCHICAL ELEMENTS IN SOCIETY.

BY WILLIAM FERRERO.*

IT IS commonly but erroneously imagined that the anarchical dynamitard is a new type of criminal, a special production of our times, while he only represents a new form of a general phenomenon which might be called "individual rebellion." In point of fact, every age in history has produced individuals dissatisfied with society, who, under the pretext of some kind of political doctrine, rebel by themselves against social institutions, and believe they can reform the world by a series of isolated acts of violence. Of such type were, for instance, the regicides whose outrages became as epidemical about fifteen years ago as are now the outrages of the dynamitards. In 1878 occurred the attempt of Oliva y Moncasi at Madrid, and at Berlin those of Hoedel and Nobiling; in 1879 Passanante made his attempt at Naples; in 1880 Garfield, President of the United States, was murdered by Guiteau; and 1884 was the year of Reinsdorf's plot to upset the imperial train in Germany. In our days the regicide has been transformed into the dynamitard; the remedy for social evils is no longer believed to be the death of a king, but the destruction of a piece of architecture. The type, however, under the different form remains the same; it is always the isolated rebel who thinks he can reform society by an isolated act of violence. What is the psychological aspect of this type? That is the most important question for the criminologist belonging to the Italian school founded by

*Torino, Italy.

Prof. Lombroso, who does not study the crimes in an abstract sense so much as the criminals in their lives. Numerous studies of psychiatrists on some of the most notorious regicides of the period 1878-1886, and the information obtained about some of the most renowned anarchists of our days afford sufficient material for an answer to the question.

That among these "isolated rebels" there are many whom the Italian school denominates "born-criminals" (*criminali-nati*), is altogether beyond doubt. Prof. Lombroso, who was the first to initiate scientific study of the different forms of political crime, has shown clearly that it is very often but a marked form of common crime; that swindlers, thieves, and murderers are always ready to join revolutionary movements of any description whatsoever, in which they find or hope to find a safer and fuller outlet for their criminal tendencies. He proved, for instance, that many regicides, Freschi, Reindorf, Hoedel, were merely common criminals, whose criminality had taken a political form. It may be easily imagined, *a priori*, that the anarchy of to-day, with its violent gospel of dynamite, must attract criminals more than any other political movement; and, as a matter of fact, Ravachol is undoubtedly a "born-criminal," absolutely destitute of moral sense, of a cynical and blood-thirsty temper, who had already killed an old man and violated a tomb before he began his career as a dynamitard. It was not so much political fanaticism that inspired him as an innate perversity, a relish for wrong-doing, and a vainglorious desire to exhibit his courage to his companions; and perhaps also the pleasure which all criminals experience in causing terror, for it must have been the acme of joy for a man of so savage a nature to know that all Paris was panic-struck by his misdeeds. We shall not, however, deal with this class of criminals at present; destined to crime, they will always commit it in one shape or another, independently of any political theory, as long as they have it in their power so to do. We propose here to present a brief study of those who are "individual rebels" in the true sense of the word; that is, those who are actually driven to crime by the adoption of some political idea.

That these "rebels" are anomalous persons cannot be questioned; but their anomaly is intellectual rather than moral. They are generally men without sanguinary instincts—sometimes, indeed, personally honorable; and the terrible consequences of their crimes are often anything but analogous to the tendencies of their characters. Felice Orsini, the famous Italian conspirator, who attempted to assassinate Napoleon IV. and killed several innocent spectators with his bombs, was a man of generous disposition, inclined to self-sacrifice and self-denial; who, animated by the most disinterested love for his country, had many times risked his head and suffered all the pains of exile in struggling against the tyranny of Austria. Nobiling displayed no tendency to cruelty; he was rather selfish in character, but so quiet that his friends called him a "harmless dreamer." Everybody has read about Pallas, who a short time ago threw a bomb at General Martiner Campos in Barcelona. Pallas was a meek, quiet man and an affectionate father, but he was always in the most miserable circumstances. He met with some anarchists and soon afterwards perpetrated the outrage, to the amazement of all who had known him, and more especially of his employers. Baffier, who attempted some years ago in France to murder the deputy Casse, as a *warning* to the French legislators who were too lukewarm about the public welfare, was a downright idealist in politics; his life and writings show everywhere a sincere indignation against the terrible corruption that is rampant in parliamentary life in the Latin countries. Vaillant was once punished for theft, but he never showed the sanguinary tendencies one would expect in a man who undertook to commit an act which was likely to end in the destruction of a great number of persons. In any case, however bad he was, he may be considered a respectable man when compared with Ravachol; and yet his crime was perhaps more blood-thirsty, as it might have involved the most disastrous consequences.

It is, therefore, not the elementary moral sentiments in which these criminals are defective, unless we make the exception that vanity predominates, more or less, in them all. Orsini used to

say that there were only two men in Italy, Mazzini and himself; and as Montazio, his intimate friend, tells us, was extremely proud of the notoriety he had acquired through his conspiracies. It is well known that Vaillant, when he was making his preparations for the deed, was so anxious that the accounts of his life in the papers should not be without his portrait, that he had his photograph taken just before he committed his crime. Baffier was extremely vain as an artist; his aim was to bring about a great artistic revolution and to be the restorer of true French art by creating a school which was only to treat great national subjects. Guiteau, the murderer of Garfield, wrote in the notice of one of his lectures: "Don't fail to come and hear Guiteau, the little giant of the West." He was so vain that when he stood before the jury, just as his fate was about to be decided, his greatest concern was to let the public know that he had received in prison more than eight hundred letters, bouquets, and presents, many of them from ladies; a statement which, moreover, was to a great extent merely an invention of his. H. M. Hyndman, too, says he has noticed that in his experience "most of them (the anarchists) have been clever but vain and boastful."

While, however, their moral faculties are sufficiently sound, the intellectual are not. It is generally believed that there is no gradual passage through intermediate stages between sanity and madness; that a man if not of sane mind must perforce be an inmate of the madhouse and *vice versa*; but this common opinion is absolutely erroneous. Modern psychiatry has shown that there are very many intermediate grades of intellectual weakness between reason and insanity, which render some individuals little fit for social life, although their segregation is not necessary; and that a great number of persons, who suffer neither from delirium nor hallucination, nor any other of the acute symptoms of madness, are yet in many respects defective in intellect. Magnan and Vergi call them "degenerates"; other psychiatrists give them the vague name of "neuropaths," and Cullère felicitously observes that their anomalies constitute "*les frontières de la folie*." Now many of

the "rebels" whose characteristics we are examining are men that live "on the borders of madland" and belong to that class of anomalous persons.

The principal characteristic of these "degenerates" is their great susceptibility to suggestion ; that is to say, their readiness to accept as their own the ideas, the sentiments, the will of other persons. It is well known that in the special condition called hypnotism this susceptibility to suggestion is artificially carried to the extreme. Now these "degenerates" are naturally and always in a state that may be called semi-hypnotic, when we consider the facility with which their minds can be influenced ; for they have almost no personality and they accept the ideas and sentiments of the environment in which they happen to be placed, just as the polypus takes the color of the water in which it lives. This characteristic can be found in many of the political delinquents we are examining, and it explains the strange contradictions of their conduct. Charles Cyvoct, who attempted in 1882 to blow up the Theatre Bellecour at Lyons, having first lived among priests, had been a most fervent Catholic ; but as a few months before his attempt he came in contact with some anarchists, he transferred his worship in a very short time from the Madonna to dynamite, and with equal fanaticism. The same thing occurred in the case of Sebastien Faure, the leader of the French anarchists, who is now in prison on suspicion of complicity in the Paris outrages. At the Jesuit School of S. Michel in Paris, Faure had distinguished himself by religious fervor ; he had intended to become a missionary and tormented himself with the severest discipline ; but later on, for unknown reasons, he abandoned the ecclesiastical career and became an anarchist. Pallas, who was a quiet and peaceful workman as long as he had nothing to do with political parties, became a dynamitard when he came in contact with the anarchists. Felice Orsini, as Montazio reports, was always an instrument in the hand of somebody ; first of Mazzini, then of the French refugees in London, who excited him against Napoleon III. and led him to plan his murderous attempt. In Vaillant suggestibility appears so strongly marked that Prof. Lombroso has

been enabled to infer, from this fact alone, that he was affected with hysteria, the morbid form in which susceptibility to suggestion is greatest.

This psychical defect explains why books have an enormous influence upon these "rebels," as upon all degenerates. A man of sound intellect and independent mind can distinguish what is true and substantial in books from what is paradoxical, fictitious, or sophistical; but for the impressionable degenerate the whole book has an extraordinary value, and the unreal and strange parts of it perhaps more than the sound parts. As there have been degenerates with philosophical tendencies who committed suicide after reading pessimistic books, so these degenerates with political tendencies take in earnest the declamations or paradoxes of some writers on the advisability of acts of violence. Baffier had overheated his brain with the writers of the French revolutions, and had convinced himself that it was necessary to give the corrupt deputies "an example." Oliva y Moncasi had been excited specially by very violent newspapers and antimonarchical pamphlets, which at that time circulated in great number in Spain. Often—what is still worse—scientific books, too, come into play, containing great theories, which are misunderstood by the "degenerates" and which produce a deleterious effect upon their intellects, recalling to one's mind Taine's sculptural phrase, "Nothing is more dangerous than a grand idea in a small brain." Vaillant, for instance, cited confusedly in his defense Darwin, Spencer, Ibsen. Nobiling was proverbial among his friends for his mixed assortment of socialistic ideas, which he had gleaned by an immense amount of heterogeneous reading, and with which he had jumbled up strange spiritualistic fancies.

As their minds are continually at the mercy of outside influences and they have no solid ground to stand on, it is no wonder that theory and practice never go hand in hand with them. Orsini, who was to become the most notorious political assassin of this century, had written several pamphlets designed to show the uselessness of political assassination and isolated attempt at revolution. Vaillant, likewise, in his last letter written to

his daughter, proclaims gentleness to be the most supreme law of life. The contradiction was in this case so glaring that even the French papers, that would only see savage beasts in the dynamitards, admitted after reading the letter that there must be something wrong in that brain.

These men are, in one word, destitute of what psychologists call the inhibitive power of the brain, the faculty of self-control; and that is the reason why their lives are almost always restless and agitated. They have followed dozens of trades and embarked on scores of enterprises, only to leave them halfway and take to something else. The revolutionary attempts of Orsini are altogether innumerable, for in every country where he went he had to conspire in some manner against Austria. Nobiling had studied philosophy; then he had made practical trial of agricultural economy and had been employed in the statistical office of the Prussian government; but having lost his post, he had been at all possible sorts of trades and ventures, roaming through almost every country of Europe. Oliva y Moncasi, when he had abandoned his mathematical studies, had successively been a sculptor, a printer, a farmer, a cooper, and a soldier. Guiteau's life is so disconnected that it is impossible to give even a simple list of the infinite number of his occupations. Vaillant, who earned his living in succession as a shoemaker, hatter, shop-assistant, and teacher of French language, appears likewise throughout his entire life to have been restless and roving, partly on account of adverse circumstances, but largely also through his own naturally unsettled disposition. All, in short, appear incapable of continuous, patient, laborious effort, but have often moments of abnormal excitement during which they are capable of the most energetic exertion.

Such being their character, it is not difficult to explain why the most extreme and most violent theories can seduce them, if we consider that the choice of a political party is more a question of temperament than of reasoning; that everybody, as a matter of fact, chooses not the party whose doctrines seem truest, but that which by its programs and methods corresponds

most with his own character. Restless, incapable of steady work for one fixed purpose, they cannot understand the policy of a continuous effort for the gradual improvement of society ; but readily accept the policy of daring strokes, of intimidating acts of violence, which is in keeping with the intermittent bursts of energy of their own temperaments. This, evidently, is the reason why even those who, like Orsini, by virtue of greater culture, recognize theoretically the uselessness and infamy of such political methods, yet adopt them in practice. The political idea which incites them to these isolated acts of rebellion varies according to place and time ; it is the national idea with Orsini ; the republican with Oliva ; the anarchical with Nobiling, Vaillant, and the others, in these times of acute economical crises ; but the psychological genesis of the attempt is always the same.

There is, however, a tremendous gulf between theory and practice. History, in fact, shows us many philosophers with violent theories who were in practice as meek as lambs ; and even in the world of the anarchists, if all those who preach the theory "*de la propaganda par le fait*" took to the use of dynamite, all the principal cities of Europe would by this time be mere heaps of rubbish. How is it then that these degenerates pass over the abyss between theory and execution ?

It is a consequence of their intellectual weakness. As on account of their suggestibility they take everything in earnest, the doctrine of political homicide and dynamite, which for others is often only a pretext for an oratorical or literary flourish, becomes to them a sacred theory, which it is their duty to put into practice. Besides, what is still more important, on account of their intellectual weakness and vanity, they easily persuade themselves that they are accomplishing a grand deed. This belief, which in their own eyes transforms their mad attempt into heroical altruism, almost all, in fact, possess and in a very tenacious and deeply rooted form. Baffier, telling in his memoirs how he conceived the idea of the attempt, uses the following characteristic phrase : "I had to save my country from a revolution by putting my head into the political engine

to stop it." Vaillant said in his defense before the jury: "The explosion of my bomb is not only the shout of rebelling Vaillant, but it is the outcry of a whole class that vindicates its rights and will soon suit its actions to its words." Guiteau, who was nearest of them all to true madness, declared he had been inspired by God: "First," he said to the judges, "the idea of homicide struck me with horror; but I saw afterwards that it was really a divine inspiration."

And so it is with all of them, more or less. Infatuated by reading, and sometimes incited by companions with whom violence is only a rhetorical outburst, their illusion is fed by their vanity, so that they easily and willingly believe themselves to be heroes and martyrs. At this point the moral sense, of which they are not devoid, becomes powerless to prevent the act of violence; every crime becomes possible, even for a man whose sentiments are naturally good enough. This is, indeed, one of the strangest phenomena of the human mind, which has also attracted Buckle's attention. After the most extreme forms of selfishness, there is nothing more dangerous for humanity than the most extreme forms of altruism—real or imaginary. Woe to society, when a man persuades himself that he has a mission, that he must save humanity from some peril or offer to it some great advantage—whether such persuasion be an hallucination produced by vanity or only an exaggerated consciousness of a real duty. There is no crime before which he will halt in fear, for the flaming vision of his mission will lead him without horror across oceans of blood.

So Buckle noted that the best Roman emperors, Trajan, Hadrian, etc., etc.,—that is to say, those in whom the consciousness of their duties was highest—persecuted the Christians with the utmost ferocity, because they considered themselves bound to defend the empire, while the worst emperors, who did not care a jot about the empire, left the followers of the new creed in peace. It is true that, from their point of view, and to a certain degree, this consciousness corresponded with reality in the case of the Roman emperors, while with a Vaillant or a Guiteau it is only an hallucination, produced by vanity and fed

by exterior suggestions. The thinker, however, who knows that hallucinations are equal to, and sometimes more intense than, real sensations and perceptions for their victims, understands quite well how these semi-lunatics, although they are not of bloodthirsty temper, can commit horrible crimes, spurred on, as they are, by a chimerical but invincible illusion.

It must be added that many other and more egoistic factors help to bring about this result, the true character of which is always more or less veiled to their eyes by the illusion of martyrdom and sacrifice. Partly through their thoughtless unsteadiness, partly on account of unfortunate circumstances, they are often condemned to a hard life, which does not satisfy their immense vanity and is sometimes really below their merits. It is, therefore, not strange that individuals so unequally balanced may some day in their dolorous and poor obscurity conceive the idea of finishing their lives by a clamorous stroke, by a crime which will make them famous and for which they will die. This is what Prof. Lombroso calls indirect suicide—a desperate form of action by which they put an end to an unfortunate life, and satisfy, finally, in their last moments of existence the craving for notoriety which has constantly tormented them. Thus some of them, like Oliva y Moncasi and Nobiling, told the judge clearly that the desire to die was one of the motives which urged them to commit the crime, and Montazio was of opinion that such a wish indirectly urged Orsini to his deed. That in Vaillant's mad attempt there was likewise as an unconscious determinant the desire to end his days clamorously, we are at least enabled to suppose, for the readiness with which he confessed his crime, the entire absence of any anxiety to save his head, coupled with his eager desire to declare clearly his anarchical theories, would seem to favor that supposition.

To recapitulate, we have before us men of sane moral sense, but of weak intellect, voluble, headless, easily influenced by other persons, and misled by reading, who almost always, greatly by their own fault but also sometimes partly by the fault of others, lead an unhappy life. With them the attempts are mostly an unconscious vengeance for their own misfortunes and

unsatisfied vanity, and become possible through a strange hallucination by which they believe that they are accomplishing an heroic sacrifice for a noble cause.

Now, if such are the perpetrators, what can be the remedy?

In France the guillotine, in Spain military tribunals, equivalent to shooting, were believed to be the best remedy and defense. It is easy to understand the passionate sentiments which in those two countries have led to the adoption of those remedies; but rather than vengeance, society requires protection—for it is undoubtedly much more important to prevent such madmen from being able to give further vent to the odd ideas which swarm in their brains than to take vengeance on some of them.

Does capital punishment serve the purpose? Experience denies it. In Spain, for instance, after the shooting of Pallas there was the explosion at the Lyceum at Barcelona; in France, after Ravachol came Vaillant, after Vaillant, Henry, after Henry, Cesario. Men like Vaillant, Nobiling, and Orsini are not to be frightened by death, for in their thoughtlessness they do not think at all of this remote consequence of their action; or if they do, the idea is sometimes, on the contrary, an incentive for them to commit indirect suicide. The supreme punishment might even act in a direction precisely opposed to its intended aim, with other degenerates and weak-brained creatures. What danger, in fact, did Vaillant really represent after his incarceration? The danger that his name and person might become the subject of a legend, in which the hysterical dynamitard became transformed into a martyr for humanity. In every class of society there are a number of weak brains who eagerly sympathize with everything, have an exterior appearance of persecution and martyrdom, and feed their own fanaticism on it. The rigors of the law, instead of inspiring fear, provoke their ardor to fight and their disposition to resist; to them it is due that all revolutionary movements—the grandest as well as the maddest—derive new life and energy from violent persecution. What line of action could be better designed to generate in these superficial minds the illusion of anarchical martyrdom than that of killing

the dynamitards? Even Ravachol, who, by the way, was beheaded for common crimes, has been idealized in pictures, in poems, in songs (*La Ravachole*), only for the very remote appearance of having become a victim of the *bourgeois*. Why should not the same thing have taken place with Vaillant, who was morally superior to Ravachol? Vaillant, in fact, has been purified by the tragical end of his defects, numerous as they were; his grave has become a place of pilgrimage of a legion of neuropaths and hysterical persons. Do these pilgrims recollect his embezzlements, his thefts, the abandonment of his wife, his inconsistencies? No; they remember only his misfortunes in life, his undoubtedly courageous behavior when in front of the guillotine. And here we have Vaillant taking his place among the ranks of anarchical martyrs!

What, then, is to be done? The Italian criminological school distinguishes two great classes of criminals, the "born-criminals," in whom the anomaly is in the first place a *moral* one, and the lunatic criminals, in whom the crime is accompanied and sometimes produced by grave *intellectual* disturbances, such as hallucinations, deliriums, etc., etc. The former ought to be rooted out by all possible means, not excluding death, while for the latter the lunatic asylum represents the best and most humane system of segregation. As the criminals we are studying, although not positively mad, are certainly nearer the lunatic criminals than the born-criminals, we suggest that they ought to be treated like the former, so much more as such treatment would also offer a great political advantage, for it would arrest the formation of dangerous legends of martyrdom. If Vaillant, after a psychiatric examination, had been sent—as would have been proper—to a lunatic asylum and placed in the ward set apart for hysterical patients, the legend of his martyrdom would not have been called into existence, nor would the history of his life have excited in a number of degenerates a most intense hatred against society. A man killed with all the gloomy theatricality of capital execution can become an unwholesome stimulant for morbid fancies, but not a man sent to the madhouse in the ordinary administrative way. No course

could, indeed, be more dangerous than that taken, especially in France, by the government and by a part of the press—the course, namely, of attributing to the present outrages the character of a duel till death between society and the anarchists. These conceited fanatics feel excited and flattered by the enormous importance which is given to them as enemies of existing society; and the impression of the grandeur of their struggle against this corrupt and wicked society grows more and more intense in them. If society did not accept the challenge of the anarchists; if they saw that their outrages only served to send the most excitable of them to the madhouse, one of the greatest incentives to these outrages would be removed. The anarchical epidemic now raging will certainly pass, as the regicidal epidemic of fifteen years ago has gone by, and as all criminal epidemics—political or otherwise—have passed; but by a more rational treatment it may be believed that the disease would be rooted out all the sooner.

Among other preventive provisions a useful one would be that of restricting the circulation of the anarchical press, because newspapers and books are often the most powerful centers of suggestion for weak brains. But it is to be feared that this may be a labor of Sisypheus for the governments, and that to-day to refrain the press might be like trying to chain the wind for any state not possessed of the enormous coercive power of the Russian government. Perhaps a somewhat restricted and cautious legislation would be more advisable, dealing with the commerce in materials required for the manufacture of explosives, so as to make it difficult for the anarchist to obtain such materials.

But first and foremost must stand the warning to parliaments and governments to endeavor to let themselves be guided in this matter more by reason than by passion, so easily excited through crimes that assume such an unusual and grave form. The more reason prevails over passion in the administration of human society, the nearer will society approximate to a state of general well-being and security.

WILLIAM FERRERO.

A CRITICISM OF HENRY GEORGE'S SINGLE TAX THEORY.

BY ARTHUR KITSON.

FOR a few years past the American political firmament has been illuminated by two conspicuous and rather interesting stars, who, though moving in different orbits and differing somewhat in glory, present to the student of economics a remarkable degree of similarity. I refer to Governor McKinley and Mr. Henry George.

To none will this comparison appear more odious than to themselves. For notwithstanding their similarity, the doctrines of each are held in abhorrence by the other. Both gentlemen stand for certain economic remedies—socialistic in their tendencies and identical in principle—which they offer as sure cures for existing industrial troubles. Both have endeavored to construct a science of economics that shall harmonize with their respective and preconceived theories, and both have fallen into ridiculous absurdities. Both seek to ameliorate the condition of labor, and each believes that this can be accomplished by taxation, and taxation only. Both appeal for support to the cupidity of certain classes. Both owe their success to popular ignorance concerning political science. Both are equally sincere, skilful, and ambitious, and each has a certain power of making others believe whatever they choose to tell them.

Here, however, the similarity ceases. The career of one has been almost a path of roses; that of the other a road of thorns and briers. Governor McKinley found a strongly organized party bent upon maintaining certain legalized privileges for the benefit of a particular class, who were ready and anxious to assist him with their wealth and influence in the propagation of his ideas.

Mr. George, on the other hand, has had to create his own party, to select and educate his assistants, to depend upon the less wealthy classes for support, and to contend against all the power and prestige of that very class which has supported his opponent. To Mr. George belongs the greater glory. He has organized a party which, judging from present signs, is destined to become a serious force in the political world; a party composed of the most enthusiastic and aggressive body of men and women that this country has seen since the days of the abolitionists.

He has written almost a complete library of economic works, which have circulated to a degree hitherto unknown in the history of economic literature. His theories are represented in both Houses of Congress. His gospel has gone out into all lands. He has crossed swords with the pope, and with philosophers, statesmen, financiers; and economists of three continents. He has written a book* criticising and ridiculing the philosophy of the greatest of modern philosophers. He gave the Democratic party of New York the greatest scare it has received within twenty years, and his adherents openly claim that the last great national victory was largely due to the writings of Mr. Henry George.

My object in drawing a comparison between these two men is to show that political success and popular applause are not indicative of public discernment of truth, nor are correct creeds or scientific systems essential in order to win public honors.

Economic ignorance is not incompatible with commanding public favors and affairs, a truth which goes a long way toward explaining the cause of our unfortunate economic condition. It is my purpose to deal with the economic theories and heresies of Mr. George—theories which are daily attracting more and more attention on the part of all classes, and winning an amount of support utterly beyond that which they deserve.

Since the publication of "Progress and Poverty," criticisms innumerable have appeared from scientists such as Prof. Huxley, and from writers like W. H. Mallock, down to the

* "The Perplexed Philosopher."

average newspaper editor. In spite of criticism, in spite of opposition, Mr. George's works have gone on gaining ground, his Single Tax Society has continued to increase in numbers and adherents, and notwithstanding the numerous onslaughts this ghost refuses to down.

The criticisms to which Mr. George's writings have been mainly subjected were made from two standpoints, viz.: the philosophical, such as those of Prof. Huxley, and the orthodox economic, such as W. H. Mallock's.

I purpose examining some of Mr. George's theories in the light of his own teachings. Agreeing, as I do, with him in his assertion that the orthodox school of economy teaches much that is ambiguous and contradictory, I do not hesitate to assert that of all economic writers Mr. George stands preëminent as the most ambiguous and contradictory that this age has yet discovered. There is scarcely a theory or idea advanced by him that he does not himself, somewhere, in some way refute.

Mr. George is a singular example of a man championing at one time certain ideas which he fiercely denounces at another, because of the particular clothing they happen to appear in. Appearances deceive him. He is an individualist, and yet he is the author and advocate of one of the most socialistic schemes ever offered to the public. He is opposed to equality, and proposes the first great step toward compulsory communism. He professes to be the friend of liberty, but he is endeavoring to exalt the state into the position of universal landlord. He champions the right of free thought, and is at the same time as dogmatic as Dr. Johnson. He hates injustice, but proposes to fix the returns to labor by the amount which can be produced upon the poorest land in use. He argues that the only rightful basis for ownership is the right to one's own produce; yet he pleads the justice of usury. He asserts the right of all to the use of the soil, and then proposes to tax men when they attempt to exercise that right. In short, to Henry George, more than to any modern writer, the French proverb may with justice be applied, "*Les extrêmes se touchent.*"

Mr. George and his single tax followers assert that the cause

of involuntary poverty, industrial crises, and low wages is due to individual appropriation of the soil, by which labor is prevented free access to land. That land is made valuable by communities, and that values so created belong to communities and not to individuals. That all men are equally entitled to the use of the earth. That the greater proportion of wealth that is created goes neither to profits nor to wages, but to swell a fund that ever grows while its owners sleep—the rent roll of the owners of the soil. The remedy for these evils is found in the single tax, which is a tax upon land values to be paid to the government, and is to be used to defray the expenses of government and for the benefit of society. This tax is not to be limited by the requirements or necessities of maintaining the government itself. It is not a tax for revenue only. It is to be determined by auctioning off land to the highest bidder, like pews in a church, the price to be an annual rental or tax. All other forms of taxation are to be abolished, and it is believed that this one tax will furnish the government with far more than it now receives from its present varied sources of revenue. This is, briefly, the single tax doctrine as expounded by its advocates.

I shall attempt to show that the single tax is, according to the writings of Mr. George, a tax upon labor, a tax upon exchange, a denial of man's just and inalienable rights, a burden upon industry—in short, a system of robbery. And in order to prove this it is only necessary to prove that rent and single tax are, in effect, practically one and the same thing.

In Book V., Chap. II., page 254, of "Progress and Poverty," Mr. George says: "The reason why, in spite of the increase of productive power, wages constantly tend to a minimum which will give but a bare living, is that with the increase in productive power rent tends to even greater increase, thus producing a constant tendency to the forcing down of wages." Again he adds (p. 255): "Land being necessary to labor, and being reduced to private ownership, every increase in the productive power of labor but increases rent—the price that labor must pay for the opportunity to utilize its powers; and thus all the

advantages gained by the march of progress go to the owners of land, and wages do not increase. Wages cannot increase; for the greater the earning of labor the greater the price that labor must pay out of its earnings for the opportunity to make any earnings at all. . . . And thus robbed of all the benefits of the increase in productive power, labor is exposed to certain effects of advancing civilization which, without the advantages that naturally accompany them, are positive evils, and of themselves tend to reduce the free laborer to the helpless and degraded condition of the slave."

In Book VII., Chap. III., he says (p. 327): "It is not from the produce of the past that rent is drawn; it is from the produce of the present. It is a toll levied upon labor constantly and continuously. Every blow of the hammer, every stroke of the pick, every thrust of the shuttle, every throb of the steam engine, pay it tribute. It levies upon the earnings of the men who, deep under ground, risk their lives, and of those who over white surges hang to reeling masts; it claims the just reward of the capitalist and the fruits of the inventor's patient effort; it takes little children from play and from school, and compels them to work before their bones are hard or their muscles are firm; it robs the shivering of warmth, the hungry of food, the sick of medicine, the anxious of peace; it debases and embrothers and embitters; it crowds families of eight or ten into a single squalid room; it herds like swine agricultural gangs of boys and girls; it fills the gin palace and groggery with those who have no comfort in their homes; it makes lads who might be useful men candidates for prisons and penitentiaries; it fills brothels with girls who might have known the pure joy of motherhood; it sends greed and all evil passions prowling through society as a hard winter drives the wolves to the abodes of men; it darkens faith in the human soul, and across the reflection of a just and merciful Creator draws the veil of a hard and blind and cruel fate!

"It is not merely a robbery in the past; it is a robbery in the present—a robbery that deprives of their birthright the infants that are now coming into the world! Why should we

hesitate about making short work of such a system? Because I was robbed yesterday and the day before, and the day before that, is it any reason that I should suffer myself to be robbed to-day and to-morrow—any reason that I should conclude that the robber has acquired a vested right to rob me?"

In Chap. I. of Book VII. (p. 308), he says: "The value of land, as we have seen, is the price of monopoly." In Chap. II., Book V., he says (p. 265): "In all our long investigation we have been advancing to this simple truth: that as land is necessary to the exertion of labor in the production of wealth, to command the land which is necessary to labor is to command all the fruits of labor save enough to enable labor to exist."

The above quotations are sufficient to give the reader Mr. George's ideas regarding rent. It is the cause of low wages, poverty, misery, slavery, industrial depression, crime, and, in short, all the ills that flesh is heir to. It is robbery—a fresh, continuous robbery, a daily, hourly robbery. And rent is due to monopoly. For "Rent," says Mr. George, "is the price of monopoly" (p. 149). He also defines rent as "that part of wealth which goes to landowners as payment for the use of natural opportunities."

Now what relation does the single tax bear to rent? Let us see. "What I, therefore, propose," says Mr. George (Chap. II., Book VIII., p. 364), "as the simple yet sovereign remedy, which will raise wages, increase the earnings of capital, extirpate pauperism, abolish poverty, give remunerative employment to whoever wishes it, afford free scope to human powers, lessen crime, elevate morals and taste and intelligence, purify government, and carry civilization to yet nobler heights, is—to appropriate rent by taxation. In this way the state may become the universal landlord without calling herself so, and without assuming a single new function."

On the same page he says: "I do not propose either to purchase or to confiscate private property in land. . . . It is not necessary to confiscate land; *it is only necessary to confiscate rent.*"

Single tax is, therefore, according to Mr. George, "confis-

cated rent." In other words, rent is a tax upon land values. "It is," he says, "this capacity of yielding rent which gives value to land" (p. 149).

And this is precisely the definition of single tax. Rent is payment for the use of land. Single tax is also payment for the use of land. In the hands of individuals it is rent. In the hands of government it is taxation. So far as the producer—the user—is concerned, rent and single tax are synonymous terms. Both are similar forms of taxation. Both are taken for the *use* of land, and both are taken from the products of labor. For, as Mr. George says (p. 149): "Land can yield no rent and have no value until some one is willing to give labor or the results of labor for the privilege of using it."

Now, if these terms are synonymous, how comes it that a system which, when known under the name of rent, is the cause of social evils, should, when designated by the term single tax, be the remedy for those same evils? What potent charm lies hidden in the words "single tax"?

The only difference in the two systems, from the standpoint of the producer, seems to be a difference in the persons permitted to collect the tax. Instead of being robbed by individuals for their own private gains, Mr. George proposes to allow the state to perpetrate the same robbery by means of its officials. The change from present conditions to Mr. George's system is simply a change of landlords; that is, from his own standpoint, a change in receivers of the stolen property. Rent, in short, is robbery by individuals. Single tax is robbery by the state. The former is the curse of mankind, the enemy of society. The latter is to usher in the millenium.

Of course Mr. George and his followers will be shocked by this attempt to draw a similarity between these terms, and yet, if words mean anything at all, Mr. George clearly acknowledges that single tax is rent, and, therefore, all he says against the pernicious effects, the injustice, the burdens created by the one, apply with equal force to the other.

It may be objected that Mr. George's contention is against individual ownership of the soil. But wherein does this evil

consist? Mr. George tells us that it arises from the exaction of rent; that wages cannot advance so long as some one has power to demand payment for the use of land. And yet he proposes to allow the state to perpetrate this very evil!

One would suppose that, having discovered the robbery, he would propose to abolish it. But Mr. George proposes nothing of the kind. Having found the thief, Mr. George persists that the police shall make the thief hand over the plunder—not to the persons from whom they have taken it, but to themselves, in order to pay them and other government officials salaries. And whatever is left after paying the expenses of government, they will expend in building roads, furnishing libraries, buying telegraph systems and railroads, endowing newly wedded couples, etc., etc. And this is Mr. George's idea of justice.

Again, he informs us that all that a man produces he is justly entitled to. He says (Chap. I., Book VII., p. 299):

What constitutes the rightful basis of property? What is it that enables a man to justly say of a thing, "It is mine"? From what springs the sentiment which acknowledges his exclusive right as against all the world? Is it not, primarily, the right of a man to himself, to the use of his own powers, to the enjoyment of the fruits of his own exertions? Is it not this individual right, which springs from and is testified to by the natural facts of individual organization—the fact that each particular pair of hands obeys a particular brain and is related to a particular stomach; the fact that each man is a definite, coherent, independent whole—which alone justifies individual ownership? As a man belongs to himself, so his labor, when put in concrete form, belongs to him.

And for this reason, *that which a man makes or produces is his own, as against all the world*—to enjoy or to destroy, to use, to exchange, or to give. *No one else can rightfully claim it, and his exclusive right to it involves no wrong to any one else.* Thus there is to everything produced by human exertion a clear and indisputable title to exclusive possession and enjoyment, which is perfectly consistent with justice, as it descends from the original producer in whom it vested by natural law. The pen with which I am writing is justly mine. No other human being can rightfully lay claim to it, for in me is the title of the producers who made it. It has become mine because transferred to me by the stationer, to whom it was transferred by the importer, who obtained the exclusive right to it by transfer from the manufacturer, in whom, by the same process of purchase, vested the rights of those who dug the material from the ground and shaped it into a pen. Thus, my exclusive right of ownership in the pen springs from

the natural right of the individual to the use of his own faculties.

Page after page is aglow with an eloquent defense of the right of a man to all he produces. Notwithstanding this, he concludes by denying to man the right of that part of his produce over and above that which can be produced from the poorest land in use. After championing the right of a man to himself and to the fruits of his toil, he ends by proposing to tax away from him a certain proportion of that fruit. Mr. George evidently assumes that the perniciousness of robbery depends, first, upon the person or persons who perpetrate the crime, and second, upon the purposes for which the plunder is applied.

What difference is it to me who takes a part of my wealth, so long as it is decreed that I must be robbed? Is it any the less burdensome to pay rent to a licensed, liveried official who calls at my house in the name of the government, than an unlicensed, unliveried, and unofficial one, in the name of a landlord?

But it will be urged by Mr. George that since he proposes to use the proceeds of his tax for the benefit of the taxpayers, it is not robbery. The answer to this is that he also proposes to apply it equally for the benefit of those who do not pay taxes. Mr. George believes that the protective system is a system of robbery. Could not Mr. McKinley reply to Mr. George, with the same show of justice, that, while he taxes imports, he applies the tax toward expenses of government and, therefore, his system is not robbery? Does the law exonerate the thief who pleads that he has returned part of the stolen property? And if governments have the right to take part of a man's wealth, where does this right cease? According to the popular theories of government, it should cease with the necessary expenses of maintaining government. But Mr. George proposes that these expenses shall not limit the amount of the tax. The state is to buy and run telegraphs, railroads, canals, etc., etc., and use the fruits of this form of taxation for carrying out various socialistic schemes. In fact, the revenue is to be governed merely by what the people are willing or are compelled to pay for the use of land.

Again, Mr. George tells us that all wealth is the product of

labor. He says, "Nature gives to labor, and to labor alone" (p. 376).

Now, since the single tax is that part of wealth taken for the use of land, it follows that the single tax is the product of labor, and is taken from labor. And by the standard of ethics which Mr. George himself lays down, to take from a man that which he produces is wrong. It is robbery. "As a man belongs to himself, so his labor, when put in concrete form, belongs to him. And for this reason, that which a man makes or produces is his own, as against all the world—to enjoy, or to destroy, to use, to exchange, or to give. No one else can rightfully claim it, and his exclusive right to it involves no wrong to any one else" (p. 300, Chap. I., Book VII.).

Tried by this standard, we may at once perceive the immorality of the single tax. For since all wealth is produced by labor, and since the single tax is a part of wealth, therefore the single tax is produced by labor. And since "that which a man produces is his own, as against all the world," and since the single tax is that which man produces, therefore the single tax is a man's own as against all the world.

Here I shall be met with another statement of Mr. George's, that rent or single tax "represents value created by the whole community," and that it "belongs to the whole community" (p. 328). This, however, happens to be merely one of Mr. George's contradictory assertions.

On page 149 he says: "No matter what are its capabilities, land can yield no rent and have no value until some one is willing to give labor or the results of labor for the privilege of using it." And again: "Rent, in short, is the share in the wealth produced which the exclusive right to the use of natural capabilities gives to the owner."

In fact, the burden of Mr. George's complaint is that rent is a tax upon labor, because it is a part of wealth, constantly abstracted from the earnings of labor. He also states distinctly and emphatically that the plan he proposes, viz., single tax, is to "confiscate rent." It therefore follows that the single tax is "confiscated labor products," notwithstanding all his

other statements about communities creating values, rent, etc.

On page 302 he says: "When non-producers can claim as *rent a portion of the wealth created by producers*, the right of the producers to the fruits of their labor is to that extent denied." Now, communities do not labor. It is individuals who labor and produce all wealth. Communities are, therefore, non-producers. If rent is a portion of the wealth created by producers, and if a claim to this, on the part of non-producers, is a denial of the right of producers to the fruits of their labor, is not the single tax an equal denial of this right? And if not, why not?

It will be well at this stage to point out the cause of the confusion and contradictions into which Mr. George has floundered. It will be noticed that whenever he speaks of the inequity, the robbery of the present land system, he almost invariably shows rent to be a part of the "fruits of men's labor." Rent, he says, is the taking of something for nothing, or, rather, the exacting of payment for the use of something which no man produced, and which all have an equal right to the use of. And rent cannot arise without labor. Hence, rent is a burden upon the shoulders of labor. But when he comes to his own remedy, when he seeks to justify this remedy, rent takes an entirely different form. It is no longer the product of labor. It arises from the mere presence of an aggregation of individuals. It arises self-created, without any exertion on the part of labor. In fact, Mr. George openly declares that all the wealth which would go to the state under the single tax, or what he terms "economic rent," is *produced without the exertion of any known factor of production*. It is true that elsewhere, in several places, he says rent is a part of wealth and that all wealth is produced by labor. But Mr. George's economic rent, which is also a part of wealth, exists without the employment of any factor. Here are his words, on page 370 of "Progress and Poverty": "While the value of a railroad or telegraph line, the price of gas or of a patent medicine, may express the price of monopoly, it also expresses the exertion of labor and capital; but the value of land or economic rent, as we have seen, is in no part made up from these factors,

and expresses nothing but the advantage of appropriation. Taxes levied upon land cannot check production in the slightest degree."

On page 328 he says: "Consider what rent is. It does not arise spontaneously from land; it is due to nothing that the landowners have done. It represents a value created by the whole community."

According to Mr. George, the state may become enriched without impoverishing the land and without the exertion of either labor or capital by the mere appropriation of economic rent. Let me suggest an improvement upon Mr. George's scheme, which he is welcome to make full use of.

He desires to hasten the dawn of the millenium. So do I. We cannot begin too soon, and if Mr. George's economic rent is what he says it is, the following will bring us with one bound right into the promised land. Land values increase with the growth of communities, and economic rent, says Mr. George, is the creation of communities without the exertion of labor or capital. Here, then, is the scheme. Let the government select some central point, say Washington, and issue a proclamation to all citizens of the United States, requesting them to come to Washington, and offering them free homes, free boarding, free living—in fact, all they may desire. The presence of seventy million people in the District of Columbia will create such an enormous fund, known as "economic rent," that neither the exertion of labor nor of capital will be necessary in order to support the community. Every one will be enabled to live a life of enjoyment and pleasure, without labor and without fear of poverty, care, or want! For "economic rent, which is in no part made up from labor and capital, but is the creation of the community, necessarily belongs to the whole community."

Here again we are strongly reminded of Governor McKinley and his assertion that a nation can enrich itself by taxing imports, since it is the foreigner who pays the tax.

In short, Henry George, with his economic rent, and Governor McKinley and his patent protective tariff that doesn't tax, are

equally worthy to occupy a niche in Fame's temple, side by side with that accorded the Rev. Mr. Jasper and his astronomical theories.

The idea that economic rent is produced without exertion by the mere existence of communities seems to be gaining ground, judging from the writings of certain modern economists. Thus, Bernard Shaw, in his address before the British Association at Bath in 1888, said, "Rent being that part of the produce which is individually unearned," etc. The statement is absolutely false—as false as that other assumption of economists known as the "unearned increment." For to admit that rent is individually unearned is to deny the first principles of economics, which says that all wealth is produced by labor and land. Communities do not labor. "They toil not, neither do they spin." Individuals, and individuals only, labor, and whatever funds the governments of communities acquire by taxation or otherwise must come directly or indirectly from the labor of individuals. Let us put the matter in plain terms. Every tax, no matter what may be its nature, form, or character, whether it be a tax on land values or a tax on imports, a tax on money or a tax upon commodities, is necessarily and unavoidably a tax upon production, a tax upon the labor of individuals, since it is a part of wealth, and all wealth is earned by some individual or individuals.

Rent is a part of wealth. Interest is a part of wealth. Tariffs are a part of wealth. All taxes are a part of wealth, and every cent taken, under any pretence, no matter by whom or for whom, whether by governments, landlords, money-lords, usurers, churches, custom-house officers, burglars, bankers, beggars, or highwaymen, comes directly or indirectly from labor. You cannot collect a tax until something is produced, and the tax collected is a part of the wealth produced by labor.

Mr. George is well aware of this, for he says that "rent or land value represents simply the power of securing a part of the results of production. No matter what are its capabilities, land can yield no rent and have no value until some one is willing to give labor, or the results of labor, for the privilege of using it."

Again, Mr. George tells us that land is not, properly speaking, a part of wealth. In this he is correct, although he does not give very good reasons for this distinction. To class the factors of production with the products themselves is contrary to a true science of economics. It is opposed to the economic production and equitable distribution of wealth. It is opposed to every sound economic principle, for it involves and leads to inevitable slavery. Labor is the father, and land the mother, of wealth. Now these two factors are the source of an infinite supply of wealth. They are themselves, therefore, of infinite value, and cannot be properly classed with their own products. Their value is incommensurable with any form of wealth, and can be expressed only by the sign of infinity, viz., zero.

But Mr. George jumps entirely from this position when he discusses his remedy. Seeing, as he does, that rent is the price of monopoly, instead of trying to abolish the monopoly and so destroy land values, he proposes to perpetuate the system and maintain them. In other words, he proposes that land shall still remain a part of wealth. His plan is analogous to that of licensing slavery under a tax of so much per capita for every slave. When slavery was abolished slave values ceased to exist. If land is not, properly speaking, wealth, land values are not, properly speaking, real values. And if land is ever excluded from that category, land values will disappear. For whatever is of value is a part of wealth—either of individual or of social wealth.

The subject of land values is as little understood by the single tax leaders as by the public at large. The impression one receives when reading the writings and speeches of some of the single taxers, is that the mere presence of a community adds to the productiveness of land. Now, I shall show that the single tax is a tax upon exchange, and its principle merely an extension of the protective system which Governor McKinley advocates, and which single taxers repudiate. And I will demonstrate this by a simple illustration.

A farmer occupying a fifty-acre farm, under the single tax *régime*, situated ten miles from the nearest settlement, produces

by his labor and that of his sons an ample supply of food for himself and his family. Occasional trips to the settlement with certain of his produce enables him to exchange it for clothes and other necessities which he is unable himself to produce. At this time his tax to the state is represented by ten. Ten years later a community has sprung up within two miles of the farm. Competition among farmers has led to several offers for his place, at a greatly increased rate. Rather than leave his home, the farmer agrees to pay to the state the highest tax bid by others, say one hundred. The mere presence of the community has, therefore, greatly increased his taxation. But what has it given him in return? Wherein has the community added to his store? The most rabid of single taxers will hardly claim that the mere proximity of the community has added one foot of ground to the farm, or increased, in the slightest degree, the fertility of the soil. The farmer will not be able to produce one more bushel of wheat, nor will the cows give one more quart of milk now than previously. *All that the community has given him is a nearer market for his produce.* Instead of carting his wealth ten miles, he now has but two miles to travel. *What he is, therefore, really paying for is market facilities, i. e., exchange facilities.* And if he is able to produce all that he and his family require, consumes all he produces, and, therefore, needs no market, this extra ninety taken from him by the community is taken without even a pretence of returning him any equivalent. Increase of land values adds not one iota to the fertility or richness of land, nor one sou to the wealth of the community. Land values are, in fact, merely speculative values—monopolistic values. Now, the argument used by protectionists is that foreign producers have no right to the home market unless they pay for it. So Governor McKinley and his friends believe that market facilities for foreigners should be taxed. And Mr. George and his followers propose to tax home producers for the same facilities.

Governor McKinley thinks Mr. George's scheme very wrong, and Mr. George thinks Governor McKinley's system a system of robbery. Single tax and protection bear a very great resem-

blance to each other, and of the two Governor McKinley's seems the more reasonable.

In attempting to justify interest, Mr. George forgets completely all that he says regarding the injustice of private ownership of land.

His position on the land and on the interest questions are so diametrically opposed to each other that it is only necessary to place his statements side by side in order to confound his reasoning.

Now what gives the increase in these cases is something which, though it generally requires labor to utilize it, is yet distinct and separable from labor—the active power of nature; the principal growth of reproduction, which everywhere characterizes all the forms of that mysterious thing or condition which we call life. *And it seems to me that it is this which is the cause of interest, or the increase of capital over and above that due to labor.* There are, so to speak, in the movements which make up the everlasting flux of nature, certain vital currents, which will, if we use them, aid us, with a force independent of our own efforts, in turning matter into forms we desire—that is to say, into wealth.

Thus interest springs from the power of increase which the reproductive forces of nature, and the in effect analogous capacity for exchange, give to capital. It is not an arbitrary, but a natural thing; it is not the result of a particular social organization, but of laws of the universe which underlie society. It is, therefore, just.—Progress and Poverty.

The right of ownership that springs from labor excludes the possibility of any other right of ownership. If a man be rightfully entitled to the produce of his labor, *then no one can be entitled to the ownership of anything which is not the produce of his labor, or the labor of some one else from whom the right has passed to him.* If production gives to the producer the right to exclusive possession and enjoyment, there can rightfully be no exclusive possession and enjoyment of anything not the production of labor, and the recognition of private property in land is a wrong. For the right to the produce of labor cannot be enjoyed without the right to the free use of the opportunities offered by nature, *and to admit the right of property in these is to deny the right of property in the produce of labor.*

Hence, as nature gives only to labor, the exertion of labor in production is the only title to exclusive possession.—*Progress and Poverty.*

On the one hand, Mr. George tells us that the only right to possession is the exertion of labor. And, therefore, since land and natural opportunities are not the products of labor, no man has a right to ownership of the soil. On the other hand, he says that interest "is distinct and separable from labor," and "springs from the power of increase which the reproductive

forces of nature give to capital," and that, therefore, "interest is just"!

If his arguments in favor of interest be sound, his attack upon individual ownership of land is both illogical and unsound. The very reasons he employs to justify the one he uses to demonstrate the injustice of the other.*

In dealing with labor and Malthusianism, Mr. George is equally unfortunate. He recognizes a law of wages and treats labor as a commodity, at the same time denying the doctrine of Malthus. Now, Malthusianism simply recognizes the fact that so long as labor is a commodity, so long will it be subjected to the laws of supply and demand. And so long as this is the case, the market for labor, like that for other commodities, is liable to become overstocked. Hence, surplus labor becomes useless, valueless, and the laborers are forced to starve. And this is true. Under the wage system Malthusianism is inevitable.

On the other hand, if labor is willing to exert itself on the land, as Mr. George says will be the case under his system, labor would cease to be a commodity. Laborers would refuse to be bought and sold, since they could employ themselves. In other words, instead of capital employing labor, labor would employ capital. The laws of wages would then disappear together with the wage system. In its place we should have the law of labor, which would simply be that the laborer would get all he produces, less his single tax. If the wage system and the law of wages be maintained, then the teachings of Malthus are perfectly true, Mr. George's assertions to the contrary notwithstanding.

I need hardly point out that Mr. George gives but a poor outlook for labor under his system. He proposes to make the state the "universal landlord" (page 364). And he says, on page

* Mr. George is as inconsistent and as obtuse as the theologians who always opposed usury of money, but admitted the legitimacy of rent. "Rent," says Bossuet, "is as far from usury as heaven is from earth." "Interest," says Mr. George, in effect, "is as just as rent is unjust." Both writers, had they searched the Scriptures more diligently, would have learned that rent and interest are but different forms of usury, *i. e.*, payment for use. See Deuteronomy XXII. 19. Usury in the form of interest had been condemned by almost every religion—Jewish, Christian, and Mohammedan—as immoral, as well as by almost every moral and philosophical writer from Confucius to Ruskin.

265, "that to command the land which is necessary to labor, is to command all the fruits of labor, save enough to enable labor to exist," which means that the standard of living under land-lordism is a bare existence.

The state will, therefore, according to Mr. George, command all the fruits of labor, which means all wealth. And this is precisely what the state socialists are after. Is it any wonder that the socialists hail Mr. George as a true prophet? "What the achievement of socialism involves," said Bernard Shaw in his address before the British Association at Bath in 1888, "is the transfer of rent from the class which now appropriates it to the whole people."

I have said that the single tax system was the first great step toward compulsory communism. By appropriating what is termed economic rent, Mr. George and his followers propose at once a grand leveling process—a leveling down to the poorest land in use. The natural inequalities in land are thus to be equalized. But now let us ask why Mr. George stops short here? Why does he not treat both or the three factors in production similarly? By what standard of right does he reduce individual returns to the poorest land in use, and not also to the poorest labor? The natural inequalities in men are, comparatively speaking, as great as in land. And as man is not responsible for his stature, strength, and physical powers, for his intelligence, agility, keenness of vision, etc., etc., is it not as unfair to allow the strong to retain all he produces from the poorest land in use, as it is to allow the weak one to retain all he produces from the best land in use?

Further, if the rent of land belongs justly to the community, because of the "value created by the community," why not apply the same rule to all other "values created by the community"? There is scarcely a business or profession the value of which does not increase with the growth of the community. In fact, where communities decline all businesses and pro-

* Mr. George is apparently undecided as to how many factors there are in production. In one place he says there are two, and in another chapter, three. He says, on page 185, "Wealth is the product of two factors, land and labor." And on page 199 he says, "Three things unite to production, labor, capital, and land."

fessions decline with them ; and where they increase, increase in values appear. Why not, then, tax physicians, undertakers, lawyers, grocers, shoeblacks, parsons, and newsboys, to the poorest individual in each profession and business respectively ?

The Georgian system, logically carried out, is, in fact, compulsory communism. It would reduce all to the level of the poorest workman. Mr. George cannot consistently stop by merely leveling inequalities in the land ; he must make his standard of remuneration the produce of the poorest labor, upon the poorest land in use.

"All men have an equal right to the use of the earth," says Mr. George. Then why, in the name of justice, does he propose to tax men for exercising this right ?

Our present landowners say that all men *have not* this right, hence they tax them. Mr. George says they *have* the right, and still he proposes to tax them. Of what good, then, is this right ? Man's inalienable right to use the soil resolves itself, according to the Georgian system of economics, into man's inalienable right to be taxed.

"All men have an equal right to the use of the earth." Granted ; but this does not say that all men have an equal right to use the *same spot* on the earth.* The earth is not yet crowded. There is still ample room for all. Every newcomer can find plenty of ground unoccupied and unused. Let us take an analogy. All persons who ride in street cars have an equal right to a seat. *But they have not all an equal right to one particular seat*, unless unoccupied. The popular sense of justice, of fair play, recognizes that the first man or woman who enters the car has the right to occupy the best seat. And the last comers accept the condition of having to stand, or of taking the least desirable seats, as in all respects right and proper. A man who would try to enforce his claim to a seat by ejecting another, would be regarded as a violator of justice, and would

*Setting aside for the present the mental confusion that the term "natural rights" inevitably gives rise to, it is evident that all men have *not* a natural right to the use of the same portion of the earth. For a "natural right" if it means anything at all must be a natural possibility. But it is naturally impossible for all to occupy or use the same spot. The statement is, therefore, senseless.

be universally condemned. In all ordinary affairs regarding the rights of men, public sentiment recognizes as just the prior claims of first occupancy and use to all others.

But now, to use once more the street-car illustration, supposing a man attempted to occupy two or three seats, by putting his coat on one, his valise on another, while others were standing, the general consensus of opinion would demand his removing both coat and valise, and permitting others to occupy what he, personally, was not. And I am inclined to think that if occupancy and use determined the right of individuals to possession of land, the evils of which Mr. George and his friends complain, as inherent in our present system, would rapidly disappear.

Probably the most contradictory of Mr. George's positions is his first asserting the right of man to what he produces, and then denying this assertion by proposing to tax away from him all over and above that which he could produce on the poorest land in use.

If Mr. George's contention for the right of labor to its fruits be just, then his single tax system is unjust. For either man is entitled to all he produces or he is not. If he is, to tax away from him all over a certain amount, without his consent, is robbery. If he is not entitled to it, then landlordism and rent are justifiable.

In conclusion, let me say that while I condemn Mr. George's writings and teachings as unscientific and as self-contradictory, no one can appreciate the good he has done and is doing in setting multitudes to investigate and think on this very important subject—the land question—more than I do.

From such agitation will eventually arise a satisfactory and just solution of the question.

ARTHUR KITSON.

THE LAW OF SERVICE.

BY W. E. BROKAW.

"A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches."

"No great masterpiece was ever accomplished when desire for money was the paramount aim. Experience proves that greed for money and noble ideals are inimical to each other's growth, and cannot exist simultaneously in the same mind."

"Whatever be his essence, man, in his physical constitution, is but a changing form of matter, a passing mode of motion, constantly drawn from nature's reservoirs and as constantly returning to them again."

IT IS a well-known fact that motion follows the line of least resistance. So does man. That is, he seeks to gratify his desires with the least exertion. There are no exceptions to this rule. If I am thirsty and my chief desire is to get a drink, I will not walk around a block or two out of my way to reach a well only half way down the block. But if I want to take a walk and, incidentally, a drink also, I may walk that far or farther, and finally come around to the well. In the first case, my dominant desire was for a drink ; in the second, it was for a walk, and in each case I would seek to gratify the desire with the least exertion. We may have conflicting desires, but the one that dominates—the chief one—is the one that directs our line of effort, and the line of least resistance to its gratification is the one on which our efforts take place. When one desire is sufficiently gratified, the next strongest becomes the ruling desire, and, as the line of least resistance to its gratification may be altogether different from the one on which we have been acting, the whole direction of our efforts may change. These are such simple, every-day truths that we have overlooked their importance. For a recognition of these facts is essential to a correct understanding of the problems of life that confront us on every hand. A lady is teaching school who exceedingly dislikes the

work, but does it simply because her parents insist that she shall. She does not desire to teach school, but she does desire to please her parents, or, at least, to live with them, and in order to gratify this desire she does as they wish. She follows the line of least resistance in the gratification of her desire. That is self-interest in operation. Reduced to its last analysis, every act of man is made in obedience to that disposition to seek to gratify his desires with the least exertion—that is, he acts from self-interest.

Man's desires are past numbering. Not only so, they are often conflicting. Hesitation is due to conflicting desires, and, until some one desire gains the ascendancy, a man is undecided as to which of certain courses to pursue. Unacquainted with himself, unused to analyzing his own thoughts and motives, man is often confused by the jumble of desires that impel him in various directions. These desires may all be divided into two classes, the desire for wealth and the desire for esteem. At first blush many may deny this, but let us investigate.

What are the first desires of the new-born babe? For air, light, warmth, milk—those things which will sustain and perpetuate its animal life. It knows no other. These, then, are the first class of desires that man feels. In the first years of the child's life these desires are supreme; other desires arise but gradually. These first desires take the form of desire for food, clothing, shelter, etc. All such things are the result of labor applied to land. Of all animals the human infant is the least able to sustain life by direct utilization of natural resources, and most dependent upon the results of labor. Wealth is the economist's name for such results. By the efforts of muscle and brain man separates, moves, combines, shapes the materials of nature in such manner as will satisfy his desires. All these materials of nature, the resources of nature, are included under the term land. All these efforts of man are termed labor. The results are called wealth. Hence it is strictly true that the first desires of man are for wealth—in order to sustain and perpetuate life. This class of desires dominates him until he has secured leisure enough to turn his thoughts in other directions.

Man is a social animal. Solitude is not his habitat. He desires companionship. The lack of such a desire is generally recognized to be due to a morbid state of mind. In order to have companions a certain degree of agreeableness is necessary—a desire to please. When there is a choice of companions man desires to be with those who have most of those qualities he deems highest and best—most agreeable to him. Hence he strives to win the attention and friendliness of such. That is, he desires their love or esteem. I call this the desire for esteem. The *fact* is what I wish recognized; the *name* of the fact is of small importance. This desire for esteem springs up as soon as man's desire for wealth (the prime necessities of life) is sufficiently appeased. All of his innumerable desires are directed by these two desires. So long as the first desire dominates man never rises above the level of the animal—above the condition of the savage. When freed from the necessity of a continual struggle for existence, the second desire becomes dominant. Then civilization becomes possible. But whether he becomes truly civilized or not depends upon the direction this desire takes.

Thus far we have simply analyzed human nature in order that we might know how to deal with it, and we have found these general rules true: That man follows the line of least resistance in the gratification of his desires; that these desires fall naturally into two groups—the desire for wealth, and the desire for esteem; that the former is the first dominant one; and that, when it ceases to govern, the latter directs man's efforts. We come now to a study of the conditions which determine the line of least resistance.

As before stated, wealth is the product of labor applied to land, hence access to land precedes the production of wealth. Without access to land, the new-born babe cannot breathe the air, nor bathe in the light of the sun. Therefore, the ease with which the first desire can be gratified depends upon the ease with which access to land is obtained. The ease with which the first desire can be gratified will determine the duration of its dominance. The more difficult the access to land, the harder it

is to get wealth, and the surer is the line of least resistance to the gratification of our desires to be found in wealth-getting.

Throughout the world land is treated as the private property of the few, and the masses are compelled to pay the few for permission to use—for the privilege of access. While such is the case the masses are ever kept competing for the privilege. Through that competition every increase of productive power, whether by invention, discovery, or skill, merely increases their ability to pay more for that privilege. Hence nothing can possibly increase the ease with which *they* can acquire wealth—can satisfy their first desire. With them, wealth-getting must continue to be the line of least resistance to the gratification of their dominant desire. To the few who control the land the getting of wealth is easy; hence, with them, the second desire finds expression. How is it satisfied? Under conditions where the vast majority of men find wealth-getting hard, the one who acquires great wealth is naturally looked up to. He is deemed beyond the fear of want. The worry and care and struggle involved in keeping the wolf from the door is something the masses are seeking to escape from, hence they will envy, if not admire, those who seem to have escaped. They copy the manners and habits of such. In so doing they feed the second desire of that class of leisure, and thus these latter also find the line of least resistance to the gratification of *their* dominant desire in wealth-getting—and they seek to get more. He who controls the most of the most valuable land has the power to acquire the most wealth.

Here the objection is raised that there are now men and women who devote their lives to labors of love, to serving their fellows, to deeds of kindness. True. But will not they tell you that in so doing they find more enjoyment than in any other way they have tried? That they have found that the purest, truest, best happiness is to be found in making others happy? Believing this, they have taken that course to obtain the happiness (the satisfaction of their desires) which the more ignorant—the less enlightened—have sought to obtain in another way. Men who do not reflect act upon first impressions, first

observations, whereas a little reflection leads to the conclusion that another way will accomplish their desires easier. In the pursuit of happiness most men act blindly, little thinking of the reason for their actions. Hence those good people who consider themselves so self-sacrificing are really seeking to gratify their desires with the least exertion ; are governed by self-interest, but in a manner enlightened by reflection. And those they deem selfish are acting from the same motive, but in a shortsighted, ignorant way. Each takes a different direction in the pursuit of happiness, in the exercise of self-interest. With one the direction is determined by reflection ; with the other, by ignorance. But so long as the very existence of men is made difficult by the difficulty of obtaining wealth, few will have time or ability to reflect ; few will be able to relieve their minds from the struggle for wealth sufficiently to enlighten their self-interest. As one writer has it : "It is customary to represent virtue as being in opposition to utility. Virtue, one says, is the sacrifice of our interest to our duty. To obtain clear ideas, it must be said there are interests of different orders, and that different interests in certain circumstances are incompatible. Virtue is the sacrifice of a less interest to a greater, or a momentary interest to a durable one, of a doubtful interest to a certain one. Every idea of virtue which is not derived from this notion is as obscure as its motive is uncertain. Those who for convenience wish to distinguish politics and morals, to assign utility as the principle in the first, and justice as that in the second, announce only confused ideas. All the difference that there is between politics and morals is that the first directs the operations of governments, the second directs the procedures of individuals, but their common object is happiness. That which is politically good cannot be morally bad, at least not unless the rules of arithmetic which are true for large numbers are false for small ones."

What are you going to do about it ? That is the question, the all-absorbing question, of the hour. Herbert Spencer has said that "as liberty to exercise the faculties is the first condition of individual life, the liberty of each, limited only by the like

liberty of all, must be the first condition of social life." We have found that such liberty depends upon freedom to use the earth. Until equal freedom in the use of the earth is secured, that condition will continue which Mr. Spencer aptly described as "the servitude of the mind to the needs of the body—the spending of life in the accumulation of the means to live." The first thing to be done, then, is plain—secure equal freedom in the use of the earth. As it is true that "*Let other conditions be what they may, the man who, if he lives and works at all, must live and work on land belonging to another, is necessarily a slave or a pauper,*" no reform can change the line of least resistance from wealth-getting until all have equally free access to the earth, on which and from which they must live. How may such freedom be best secured?

If there are one hundred men on an island and they are equally free to use the land, no one of them can use any portion of it to the exclusion of the rest without giving them an equivalent for such exclusion. So long as he holds such portions as no others desire to use, he is not doing so *to their exclusion*, but the moment others desire to use such portions he is. The holding then becomes a privilege, the value of which depends on the number desiring to use it—that is, the number excluded. The number desiring that location will depend upon the advantages of every kind which that location has over other accessible locations. It is to derive the benefits of these advantages that each desires undisturbed possession of that location. The location having the most advantages will be the most desired—the most competed for. Its value—that is, the value of the privilege of exclusive possession of it—will be the difference between its advantages and the advantages of the least desirable location needed. As population increases more locations will be needed and less desirable locations forced into use, thus increasing the advantages of the best location. For any one to assume exclusive possession of such location, and refuse to compensate the others for exclusion from the benefits of its advantages, is for him to assume greater freedom than they, and thus to deny them equal freedom with himself. As the last immi-

grant who lands on the island, by necessitating the use of more land—that is, by forcing into use less desirable land—thereby increases the advantages of the best location, denying him access without compensation is as much a denial of his equal freedom as the similar exclusion of those who were there at the time the location was first monopolized. It is evident, then, that exclusive possession of locations can be consistent with equal freedom *only* when each such possessor pays to the rest the value of such privilege. And as the value of such privileges is constantly changing, owing to the increase of population necessitating the use of less desirable locations, frequent revaluations would be necessary to perpetuate equal freedom.

But such use of land necessitates common ways or paths, called highways, as a means of communication and exchange. If there were no such common ways, no one could get to others than those who held locations adjoining his own, except by the permission of the latter. Hence exclusive holdings necessitate common holdings—highways. There must be equal freedom in the use of these else all will not be equally free. As such highways are necessitated by the existence of exclusive holdings, they must be maintained for the free use of all; each must be as free as every other to use them. If, then, the fund arising from the payment of the values of the exclusive holdings be used to maintain the highways, each will be contributing to such maintenance in proportion to the advantages his location receives from the existence of such highways, and equal freedom in the use of the common holdings will be secured.

Having shown how equal freedom in the use of the earth may be obtained and perpetuated, the question arises, will that make wealth-getting easy for the masses, and, if so, what will be the effect of such a change?

There can be no doubt, after careful investigation of the facts, that the productive power of man has been increased at least forty times within the last hundred years; that is, that with the same effort a man can produce forty times as much as he could a hundred years ago. When one contemplates the enormous effectiveness given man's efforts by the use of steam and elec-

tricity and the economy taught by a better knowledge of the elements and forces of nature, he is prepared to believe that the above estimate is far less than the truth. The increase of productive power between the thirteenth and nineteenth centuries was not as great as it has been since, but there was some increase. In his "Six Centuries of Work and Wages," J. E. Thorold Rogers shows that eight hours was an average day's work and that it secured to the laborer a healthy and comfortable living, considering the conveniences to be obtained at that period. If eight hours a day would secure a healthy, vigorous life to the average laborer, and there were none who were compelled to beg or starve, in the thirteenth century, surely the condition of the laborer to-day ought to be at least eight times better, now that his power to produce those things that satisfy his desires is not less than forty times as great! Surely one hour a day ought to secure him a healthy, if not a luxurious living. Equal freedom would enable each to reap the benefit of his increased productive power. The acquiring of sufficient wealth to gratify all ordinary desires for a comfortable living would then be within easy reach of all who were willing to work. And what of that?

When wealth-getting becomes easy for all, the accumulation of more than one needs will give no one an advantage over others nor secure their envy or respect. It will not be necessary as a precaution against the fear of want. What all can obtain with ease none will scramble for. The easy acquisition of wealth by all means the easy satisfaction by all of the animal or first desires. That means the dominance in all of the second desire. But under such a condition the second desire would lack the food it now lives on and grows by. Things live by what they feed on. The second desire of the rich is to-day fed by the envy and flattery growing out of the poverty of the masses. Under equal freedom there would be no such food obtainable. That desire, being dominant, would then find the line of least resistance in serving others; in giving, not taking, advantage in the business relations of life. He who resorted to unfair, dishonest, or injurious ways of acquiring

wealth, where wealth could be easily and honestly acquired by all, would receive the contempt of mankind. He would soon find his self-interest—his desire to avoid that contempt—compelling him to seek to deal honestly and fairly with all and to gain their friendship by benefiting them.

Man is naturally kind and thoughtful of the comfort of others, where there is nothing to turn him the other way. This I saw illustrated every time I went over the elevated road between the heart of Chicago and the World's Fair grounds. In getting on the trains, there was always a struggle and a jam when there was a crowd. But in getting off, there was an apparent readiness to await the pleasure of others. Why this difference? Why the scramble to get on, but not to get off? Because of the fear that if they did not try to be among the first to get on they might have to await the passing of many trains before getting a chance to ride. But they knew that there would be opportunity for all to get off. It is always thus. That is human nature.

The struggle for wealth will never cease while wealth-getting is hard, and it is believed that some will be in danger of not getting enough to live on. But that struggle will end when it is known that there is no danger of starvation or pauperism for him who is willing to do a moderate amount of labor. And to establish this feeling of security it is not necessary for the state to guarantee to every one a living; it is only necessary for it to guarantee that no one shall be permitted to infringe upon the equal freedom of others. Each will thus be assured that whatever he produces shall be his own and that he can obtain an equivalent for it in exchange. Each will know that to obtain wealth he must produce wealth. Each will then realize that the world does not owe him a living, but merely the opportunity to produce and enjoy a living. As each man's living will thus depend upon his own efforts, there will be no incentive to shirk work in order to get the benefit of a guarantee of a living from the state. The line between "mine" and "thine" will be most accurately drawn and thoroughly respected. The pride of each to be self-supporting and of service to others will develop inde-

pendence and individuality. Then men will cease to worship wealth, and gold will cease to be our god. But that time can never come so long as the earth, from which all wealth *must* be produced, is treated as the property of a *part* of the people who inhabit it.

The line of least resistance to the gratification of man's dominant desires will always be found in wealth-getting so long as the earth is held under present methods of tenure, no matter what else the ingenuity of man may discover in the way of productive powers, or do in the way of reforms. This may be seen by noticing that every improvement in a community (whether in public conveniences, educational facilities, morals, or anything else) makes that a more desirable place to live in and thus tends to cause people to pay more for the privilege of living there. The purging of the slums in one part of a city will thus raise rents there and cause the poorest class to seek other quarters, but can *not* abolish slums so long as landlords can pocket land values. The city that does most to aid the poor will attract the more people to it.

So long as the corner in land continues and vast numbers of men are forced to compete for the privilege of access, every effort made to aid such men in their struggle for existence will attract that class to the places where the aid is being extended, and thus increase the value of such locations. So that, in the last analysis, every dollar given in alms is a dollar given to the earth "owners." All such efforts resemble the bailing out of a sinking boat with a teaspoon—it may slightly postpone the catastrophe, but cannot prevent it. A few are rescued here, but more are lost there, and the maelstrom is gaining in force. It has been said of General Grant that he preferred to sacrifice many lives in forcing the fight to a finish, rather than to prolong it in the attempt to save those lives, believing that such a course really saved the most lives in the long run. Just so the hastening of the removal of the cause of slums and their correlatives will prevent more suffering than the same effort devoted to alleviating a few of the present victims. Let those who do not see the remedy do the bailing, but let those of us

who comprehend the situation weigh well the probabilities before dividing our time between palliative and remedial efforts.

But the line of least resistance to the gratification of man's dominant desires will be found *only* in serving his fellows, when once he has secured equal freedom in the use of the earth. To prove the contrary is the impossible task that confronts those who defend present land-tenure systems and oppose the views herein set forth.

As I have already shown, all men are pursuing happiness by seeking to gratify their desires with the least exertion, and that is self-interest. In the sense, therefore, that the word "law" is generally understood, when used with reference to nature, the law of service may be said to be found in *enlightened* self-interest, while the law of greed is bulwarked by so-called "vested rights" and is based on *ignorant* self-interest. The first line of effort, then, for those who would educate and uplift the masses, is in changing the line of least resistance by securing equal freedom in the use of the earth.

W. E. BROKAW.

POPULAR GOVERNMENT: ITS DEVELOPMENT AND FAILURE IN ANTIQUITY.

BY DR. ADOLPH MOSES.

HUMAN society since the beginning of its existence had been in vain grappling with what seemed an insoluble problem, when the American people appeared on the scene. With one stroke of genius, with the creation of the federal form and the framing of the constitution embodying the new theories of government, it gave to this problem a natural and permanent solution. How to combine the greatest possible liberty of the individual with the sovereign power of the state, has been from time immemorial the question of questions, to which, try as he might, man was unable to give a satisfactory, practical answer.

Through countless ages the pendulum had been swinging backward and forward from one extreme to the other, from the weakness and anarchy of individualism to the debasing omnipotence of the state. Among the lowest savages, whose life and conduct is raised but a little above that of the brutes, the individual practically lives in a state of absolute freedom and independence. He is law, magistrate, and state unto himself. There is no social law prescribing to the individual the way he should go so as not to trespass upon the rights of others; there is no fixed rule of justice keeping his desires within the bounds of equity. There is no magistrate to summon and punish him for having done injury to a fellow-man; redress of wrong is left to private revenge. There is no protection and safety for the weak; hence to be weak is the greatest crime, to be strong the highest virtue. There is as yet no state which binds many wills together by the ties of common interests, institutions, and ideas; there is no society in which the energies, physical, mental, and moral, of myriads of human beings blend and form a living unity em-

bracing all and dominating over all. The most degraded and miserable savages, such as the Digger Indians of California, are as free as the beasts of the field, but their life is almost as bestial, as narrow, and morally as worthless as that of the animals which they hunt.

Man is or rather becomes man only in society. What the air is to the physical organism, the social atmosphere is to the intelligence of the soul. It is in this medium alone that man the artist, the thinker, and free agent, can live and grow, and bring to birth his marvelous powers slumbering in the germ. The innermost nature of man is social. Human and social are synonymous terms. The most characteristic, the most human of all man's powers, language, without which he would sink to the level of the dumb brute, by means of which he lays hold of what is in nature without and in his mind within, by virtue of which he keeps the universe folded up within the narrow compass of his brain—language ever was and is the offspring of social relations; it is the lightning which the electric touch of soul to soul causes and has ever caused to flash forth.

Nowhere and at no time has man been found without the institution of a permanent family. Even in its least developed form the family is a social organism, containing within itself the promise and potency of national and political societies. The family is the primary union, made up of several individuals that are held together by the bonds of conjugal affection and mutual helpfulness, of parental love and authority, of filial dependence, obedience, and gratitude. The members of the family act together as a unit. What hurts one gives pain to all; what is profitable to one is felt to be beneficial to all. Along with community of interests and conditions there goes a more or less intimate community of feelings and thoughts, of sympathies and antipathies, of hopes, aspirations, and experience. The family is the birthplace and nursery of all the virtues, of love, sympathy, affection, trust, patience, forgiveness, truthfulness. All the moral and social laws, justice, equity, equality, had their original home within the circle of the family, and to this day they draw their chief nourishment from the soil in

which they originated. Even the seeds of free and representative government germinated in the soil of the family. True, authority over the whole family was almost everywhere vested in the father, but this authority was not tyranny because it was not selfish in its nature and scope. The father held rule in behalf of all, in the common interests of all. He represented and carried out the will of all who were identified and, in a sense, identical with him as members of one body. In point of fact, the father acted in most matters, great and small, with the tacit or declared consent of the older members of the family. It was the public opinion of the family group which in the last resort virtually determined the decisions and actions of the family head.

In the course of a few generations the family multiplied and increased in numbers to such an extent that it could no longer stay together in the same dwelling-place, and support itself on the products of the circumscribed territory which it occupied. It split up into several families which, though living at a certain distance from one another, continued to be held together by the ties of blood-relationship, by the worship of the same family gods, and by the bonds of common speech and customs. Thus a higher union, of which families made up the units, came into existence by a natural process of development. Such a higher union, rising above and containing within itself the primary union of the family, is usually called the clan. It was to all intents and purposes a body politic, for it already discharged the functions of a political society by means of a representative assembly, which met from time to time as the occasion required. The representative assembly was composed of the heads or the fathers of all the families. By the Teutonic races they were called Elders, Gerontes by the Greeks, Senators by the Romans, Zekanim by the Hebrews, all which names signify the old ones, that is to say, the fathers. The representatives of the families deliberated only on questions which regarded the interests common to all the families forming the clan; they took measures such as were intended to preserve and increase not the good of any one individual, but the good of all alike. The assembly of

the elders did not meddle in the least with the government of the several families. The father or elder of each family continued to be the guide and ruler, the law-giver and judge, and if need be the executioner of the individuals living under his authority. The self-government of the family was left untouched. The assembly of the elders had a higher and more general office. It concerned itself chiefly with matters relating to outlying or hostile clans, with questions of war and peace, of defense and attack, of alliance and peaceful traffic with neighboring tribes. Moreover, it had the worship and sacrificial service of the clan gods under its charge.

Naturally the wisest, strongest, and richest clansman, who was usually the head of the most numerous family, was chosen as chief in war and leader in the affairs of peace. Where the original conditions of society had not been altered by disturbing and modifying influences, the chief enjoyed no special privileges, he wielded only as much authority as was voluntarily delegated to him by the heads of the families. As a rule, the chieftainship tended to become hereditary in a family. The reverence of the clansmen for the memory of a chief who proved strong in war and wise in peace inclined them to elect his son as his successor, because they believed that the father's prowess and prudence were transmitted to his children by virtue of inheritance. The more primitive a society, the stronger is the belief of men in the powers of heredity, the more firmly do they hold that blood carries over from parents to children and children's children not only all their physical but also all their emotional, mental, and moral qualities. At a time when blood was everything in practice, when it was the only bond of social union, the only fountain of human sympathy and right, blood was endowed with every possible power for good and evil; it was made to play the part of fate in the character and actions of individuals and tribes, and served as an all-sufficient explanation of both the uniformities and the diversities observable in the phenomena of human life, individual and collective.

The primitive ages believed blindly in genealogy; race or blood was the ready answer to all questions. The modern

baneful faith in blood and the fanaticism of race is but a revival of the primitive philosophy of the savage, to whom it rendered indeed invaluable service, blending individuals into families, fusing families into clans, and welding clans into the unity of the tribe. For the tribe grew out of the clan just as the clan developed out of the family. In process of time a clan grew so numerous and occupied such a large area that its bonds of cohesion became loosened and it split up into several clans. Yet these clans, in most cases, continued to hold together by virtue of their common parentage, language, traditions, and religion. These forces of mutual attraction caused them to form a social and political union of a higher kind. The self-government of the clan was not infringed upon. Its local affairs were managed, as heretofore, by its own council of elders. But the management of the most general affairs, such as peace and war, treaties of commerce, and intermarriage with other tribes, religious feasts and sacrifices in honor of the tribal god, was taken over by the tribe.

All questions of moment were deliberated on and decided by an assembly composed of the chiefs and the elders of all the clans. The most powerful and renowned among the chiefs was chosen as head chief, either for a time and a special occasion or for life. As in the clan so in the tribe the same causes coöperated to make the chieftainship hereditary in one family. However, even the supreme chief was not a sovereign in our sense, but merely the first among his peers. A tribe so constituted was virtually a people, small but free. There were self-governing families, forming the primary units; the clan enjoyed local self-government for all its internal affairs; every head of a family appeared in person and cast his vote. The administration, as much as there was of it, lay in the hands of an elected or hereditary tribal or supreme chief, who on all matters of importance had to consult the council consisting of the clan chiefs.

It is needless to say that every tribe known or unknown to history did not pass through all these phases of political development above described, nor present all the features of local and central government set forth by us. We have been

speaking of normal tribes, such as are known to have existed both in the Old World and the New. The process of compounding organized groups of men into higher unities did not cease with the formation of the tribe. In many parts of the world several tribes living in close proximity coalesced and formed a people. The Roman people represented a fusion of three tribes. All the cities of Greece, from glorious Athens down to the most insignificant backwoods towns in Arcadia, grew out of a combination of several neighboring tribes. As with the clan and the tribe, so with the people; the ties of blood relationship, real or assumed, formed the ideal bond of union among the various parts. All the members of a people believed themselves descendants of a common ancestor. The myth-making power of the popular imagination never failed to supply the required patriarch or patriarchs. The political organization of such a people was in most points simply a reproduction of the tribal organization on a larger scale, with such modifications and additions as the larger and higher unity demanded. The self-government of the tribe in its internal affairs was for a long time restricted as little as possible. Tribal meetings and clan meetings continued to be held as heretofore, to deliberate and decide questions of purely clannish or tribal interests.

The popular assembly of the people consisted of the heads of all the families. The chiefs of all the clans originally made up the senate, which was not only a deliberative but to a large extent an executive body. At the head of the whole people and of the senate was the supreme chief or king with limited powers. His highest functions were the leadership in war and the high-priesthood. As each tribe had its own tribal god to whom the head of the tribe offered sacrifices at stated times in the name of all the tribesmen, so had every people its own supreme national deity. Him the supreme chief of the whole people approached at certain seasons and on extraordinary occasions, with incense and animal offerings, to propitiate him and implore his favor in the name and on behalf of the entire nation. In Rome and in Greece, Sparta excepted, the heredi-

tary chief or king was later on supplanted by the heads of the clans, and one or more elective chiefs took his place.

In the political development and organization of ancient society the reader will readily recognize the beginnings and outlines of what he knows to be the political system of the American commonwealth. But the ancient societies, similar as they are in many respects to our political ideas and institutions, lacked one formative element of vital importance. The absence of this element, together with other causes, prevented them from growing and expanding beyond certain limits along the line of liberty, and compelled them to give up the precious boon of freedom as the price for expansion in territory and accretion of outlying populations. With one exception in the later history of Greece, the ancient state never applied to political uses the fruitful principle of representation. By means of this device large bodies of men are represented by a small number of elected delegates or representatives, who deliberate, vote, and act in their name and their interest. This principle lies at the very root of our constitution, and without it our system of government could not stand for one week. Seventy million sovereign human beings are represented by about four hundred twenty chosen congressmen, who carry on, in two halls, the political and legislative work of a vast nation inhabiting a continent.

Legislation and government by means of popular assemblies consisting of all free citizens or the heads of all the families, is possible only for a small people living in close proximity within a restricted area. Soon the limit is reached beyond which territories and tribes conquered, or won over by peaceful means, cannot be represented in the popular assembly at the seat of government. Rome, for instance, could not incorporate all the inhabitants of Italy into her own citizenship, and from time to time summon three or four million voters to appear in the forum to deliberate and pass laws. Hence, each of the ancient free states or democracies was of necessity a mere city with a comparatively small area surrounding it. As soon as a people or city conquered another people and land lying at a distance, it

was bound to treat the conquered as subjects who had to obey laws not of their own making, to pay tribute in support of a government in which they had no share. These subjects were governed more or less despotically by a prefect sent to them by the ruling people. The rights of local self-government, if not entirely abolished, were constantly interfered with and violated by irresponsible rulers. They were regarded and dealt with as an inferior class of human beings who enjoyed whatever rights were left them only on sufferance. The more lands and nations were conquered and added to the empire, the larger became the number of those who had only to pay taxes, to fight, and to obey. A small ruling people had constantly to watch and keep within the bounds of obedience subject races that often outnumbered the governing class as ten to one. Insurrections and wars were, therefore, the order of the day. The bravest nations that rose again and again to regain their lost independence were after each defeat reduced to an even worse state of misery, till at last their love of liberty and their manhood were crushed out of them, and they came to form part of the dumb mass of down-trodden subjects. While the policy of the ancient free states proved a failure abroad, the difficulties went on increasing within in proportion to the growth of the inhabitants.

In course of time the number of free citizens became too bulky and unwieldy to be a working, deliberative, popular assembly. Demagogism and corruption became rife. The meetings of the sovereign people proved disgraceful farces, government by the people became a snare and a delusion. The welfare of whole nations, questions pregnant with fateful issues, were submitted to the vote of a howling and hungry mob. Rich, ambitious, and talented men, often sincere patriots, made use of the wretched electoral machinery to gain immense power and influence, and virtually to become sovereigns of the state. The question was only as to who should be sole ruler, Sulla or Marius, Pompey or Cæsar. The so-called Roman Republic during the last century before its downfall was rotten to the core; the despotism of the emperors was the only thing that prevented the empire from going to pieces. All ancient repub-

lies were bound to pass into monarchy or despotism. In course of time the Cæsars made all the inhabitants of their empire citizens of the Roman state, but all were alike subjects and servants of their respective rulers. They had no voice in the government. Universal servitude ate into the vitals of the Roman world and consumed all moral energies. Teutonic tribes rushed into the weak and prostrate empire and made themselves masters of immense numbers of human beings. They virtually enslaved the whole subject population. They became a powerful nobility, placed as to rights, wealth, and influence high above the mass of the people. To all intents and purposes, the latter possessed no rights of property or person which the ruling Teutonic nobility was bound to respect. The invading Teutonic tribes, now become a powerful aristocracy, brought with them into their new homes the free political organization outlined above. For a time they tried to keep it up in their new environment. They regarded and treated their kings as but the first among equals. They met from time to time in general meetings to deliberate and resolve on matters of public good and common interests. But the attempt to preserve popular government within the circle of the ruling nobility soon broke down on the Continent. First, the nobles or ruling tribes lived too far apart, being scattered over an enormous territory. The whole or even a large part of the nobility could not come together from far distant points. The principle of representation by deputies was unknown to them. In the second place, the nobility formed in reality a large ruling army that had to keep down their subjects, or rather serfs, with an iron hand. They were really in a state of constant war. Now in war, obedience to the command of the leader is the first and indispensable requisite.

Where blind obedience to a chief is required, popular government is bound to sicken and die. The greater nobles, moreover, strove everywhere to make themselves independent sovereigns, and in many places did succeed in severing all connection with the supreme ruler, the emperor. The great lords had at their beck many thousands of able-bodied serfs who obeyed

blindly the commands of their master, and had not the faintest idea of personal liberty, not to speak of popular government. In course of time the lesser nobles were suppressed by the greater nobles or chiefs with the help of the unfree masses, who were willing to aid a powerful master promising them protection against the grinding oppression of the smaller tyrants. The more powerful the kings became, the more absolute did their rule grow to be, the more thoroughly did every trace of popular government disappear from the face of the European continent.

It was a fortunate concurrence of many favorable circumstances that the elements of popular government were preserved and developed in England. It redounds to the eternal glory of England that she invented the great principle of representation by means of delegates or deputies, chosen by larger bodies of men to be their mouthpiece and agents, to represent and defend their rights against the king and his servants. But for the introduction of that great principle into the political life of mankind there would exist no popular government anywhere in Europe. But for that principle the marvelous system of the American commonwealth could never have come into existence; nay, the thirteen original colonies could not have been transformed into the United States. But for this unifying and integrating principle the American Union could not have been born. Poland is the only modern nation that tried to govern a large kingdom by means of a popular assembly consisting exclusively of noblemen, but in which every nobleman appeared in person and cast his vote. The attempt led to anarchy in theory and practice, and destroyed both national independence and freedom.

Russia is the only country in which every trace of representative government has been wiped out. It has led to the most crushing despotism on the one hand, and on the other it has raised a sect of political enthusiasts who preach nihilism and anarchism, the total destruction of all political and social bonds, and the dissolution of society into its component primary units, or individuals, as the only salvation of men, as the only refuge from the curse of the tyranny of the state. But the American

people have taken up the political problem of the ages and dealt with it in an original way, yet along the lines of historical development. Making an exceedingly wise and ingenious use of the new principle of representation inherited from England, they have succeeded in binding together the greatest possible freedom of the individual with the sovereign powers of the state. They have destroyed nothing, but have fulfilled whatever was good and vital in the political past of the race. They have created a system of government in which all the fruitful seeds of political life sown by bygone ages and departed nations have come to flower and to bear their ripest fruit.

ADOLPH MOSES.

PULLMAN AND ITS REAL LESSONS.

BY J. W. MASON, ESQ.

IN ONE sense, it may justly be considered a calamity that he who writes so ably and entertainingly as Thomas Burke Grant in the August number of this journal, should seek to arouse prejudice and create a false view of the very important subject of the late strike.

Opinions may be easily warped and biased by a merely personal view. There was involved in the great shadow which lately passed over this land not George M. Pullman nor the American Railway Union, but the issue of free government in this country. "Principles are everything, men are nothing." It is immaterial who George M. Pullman is—whether he be the monster with heart of flint as pictured by Mr. Grant, or a benign philanthropist like Sir Titus Salt; whether he makes the use of his means that we would under like circumstances or not; but, does he use his property as he is entitled to under the law of this government. His manner of using it is a matter of personal taste. That taste may be such as to deserve the condemnation of all humane men, but it does not affect his personal or political rights. The workmen at Pullman had no more right to say that he should operate his works at a loss, or at all, than he had a right to say that they should continue in his employment, whether they so desired or no. To give Pullman the right to say the latter makes slaves of the employees; and to give the employees the right to say the former would be a species of slavery no worse in its results. The action of Pullman from a moral standpoint may have been as bad as the action of the men from the same view, but morals cannot be enforced or inculcated by acts which do violence to moral laws and the laws of the country.

The reasoning of those who engaged in the strike must be something as follows: Pullman has accumulated a vast fortune; his greed and selfishness lead him to acts of oppression and injustice, and we will undertake to work a change, not only in the natural disposition of the man, but in the methods and policy of his business. To accomplish these praiseworthy ends, the men ask to "arbitrate the matters of dispute—rent, etc." Mr. Pullman responds that "there is nothing to arbitrate." The writer says: "Several days now elapsed during which there was no attempt at violence or intimidation in any form." The men then saw that their lawful attempts at reformation were unavailing and they resorted to crime—crime against person, property, and civil liberty—to enforce reformation. It will not do to say that the right of revolution always remains. This was not a revolution, but a riot. I think it was Lafayette who said that revolution may be the most holy of duties, but that riot was the most fatal of attacks. Victor Hugo, that friend and champion of the people against the oppressions of kings and wrongs of every nature, said:

There is riot, and there is insurrection; they are two passions, one of which is just, the other unjust. In democratic states, the only ones based on justice, it sometimes happens that the fraction usurps power; in that case the whole people rise, and the necessary demands for their rights may go so far as taking up arms. In all the questions which result from collective sovereignty, the war of all against the fraction is insurrection, and the attack of the fraction on the masses is a riot. What universal suffrage has done in its liberty and its sovereignty cannot be undone by the street.

Admitting the assumptions, assertions, and newspaper interviews contained in the article in question, we have to acknowledge that the writer makes out his case against Pullman, but how does that aid or palliate the unlawful and criminal acts of the strikers? A wrong is not made right by a greater wrong. We are told that the Pullman Company was determined to starve out its men, and are invited to infer that the strike was a justifiable protest, as the men had "under these circumstances but to strike or starve." The men did strike, and the strike failed; was starvation prevented by that act? Surely not; that dire

calamity was averted by the men returning to work, and at the old wages. This demonstrates that the element of starvation did not enter into the controversy. These words, "starvation," "pauperism," and other epithets, coupled with sensational headlines from sensational newspapers, skilfully handled, tend to obscure the real facts and issue, and lead one away from the real lesson of Pullman and its strike. That lesson is far deeper and more significant than anything suggested in the article. The strikers at Pullman not only quit work themselves, but by violence and intimidation prevented others, equally as worthy and hungry, from earning an honest living. They not only sought to ruin the industry of Pullman and its people, but to bring ruin and disaster throughout the whole land. They and their backers, by a scheme as gigantic as it was wicked, sought to make the industrious and contented of the country idle and discontented—ruin the business of innocent men, and extend the starvation, alleged to exist at Pullman, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Happily, they mistook the American people. The morning after Mr. Sovereign made his attempt to call out all members of labor unions, I happened in a large union barber shop. I asked the man shaving me what he thought of Sovereign's order, and if he was going to quit work. He replied: "Why should I go out? My employer has been paying me union wages and has kept his agreement, always; now, why should I turn round and attempt to ruin him and his business? The rest of the men in the shop feel the same way, and I think that is the view men generally will take. No, Mr. Sovereign has mistaken the temper and underrated the honesty of the laboring men of this country. Mark what I tell you, they will not obey his order." If that humble workman could have exchanged places with Mr. Debs, what a world of loss, distress, and crime he could have saved this country.

The real lesson of Pullman seems to have escaped the writer of the article in question, but seems not to have escaped Mr. Debs, as he now declares that he will never engage in another strike, but will labor to accomplish necessary reforms through the ballot-box. Mr. Debs is on the right track. The general

and real enlightenment of the people, with that enlightenment expressed at the ballot, is the only way reforms can be wrought in this country. That is the lesson of the Pullman strike. The supremacy of the law must, at all times, be exalted. Reforms must be accomplished within the forms of law. Boycott, murder, arson, and intimidation have no place in working out the destiny of this free people.

It is in no way a personal lesson as to Mr. Pullman, his greed, avarice, or injustice. There is a principle involved and not a personality. If his "model city" is a failure, it bears its own lesson and carries within it its own condemnation. If less successful than other communities founded upon somewhat similar principles, and ought not to succeed, it will not. The pathway of all progress is strewn with mistakes, failures, wrecks, and exploded ideas. Any enterprise conducted upon false principles will fail without the intervention of a thousand-fold worse mistake or crime. It fails because it is out of harmony with its environment; and that is why strikes and boycotts, such as we have just witnessed, fail and must continue to fail.

Laws must be just to all, and all must stand equally before the law. The civil rights of one man are as sacred as the civil rights of any other individual. The law of the land is more just in this respect than the law of nature. Every man must be free to develop within the limits of his capacity, and the function of government is performed when it protects him in that freedom, and keeps him within its bounds.

A man's wealth or poverty does not change his status before the law. The law is made for one as well as for the other. We read in newspapers and periodicals of the day, and hear it proclaimed from the rostrum, that laws are passed in favor of the rich and against the poor, and there is a general, undefined belief among the less informed that such is the case. It is one of the most dangerous falsehoods that can be promulgated. It is about time to call for a bill of particulars. It will be instructive and to the point to have a single law, national or state, singled out which has been enacted for the purpose or with the effect claimed. In most instances the wealthy of to-day were

the poor of a generation ago; and the rich man of the future, the promoter and manager of vast enterprises necessary to a higher civilization, will be the poor boy of the present. Do we want to change conditions to make this impossible? Would we limit the scope of an untrammelled individualism for a sterilized and impotent paternalism? I can speak from the standpoint of a poor man. I am not satisfied with the condition, but look in vain for any act of legislation which has imposed it upon me.

I do not know Mr. Pullman. If he is one half as bad and wicked as pictured, I do not want to know him. But the personal abuse of him does not tell the story or teach the true lesson of Pullman and its strike. The lesson taught is that one sixteenth thousandth of the people of this country, to right a fancied or real grievance, cannot stop the wheels of industry and the highways of commerce throughout this whole land, and coerce, by violence and crime, the recognition of a principle which itself is wrong in every particular.

Bradstreet estimates that the reign of Debs cost this country over \$81,000,000, and that over half of this vast sum is loss of wages to employees themselves. This does not tell the whole story, as it leaves out of consideration the loss of life, the misery, and poverty brought into multitudes of homes by the loss of employment, to say nothing of the demoralization caused by organized contempt and disregard of law.

The dupes of Debs, when they have time to consider these things and realize their full import, may well forget the crime of Pullman in contemplating the enormously greater one of Debs. It is better, when speaking of these things at all, to tell the truth and point the true lesson. Hatred of one man cannot justify, or should not justify, in the minds of the people the crime of another man.

Now, after all this loss of life, property, time, wages, and opportunity for future earnings, what has been accomplished? How far has the cause of labor been advanced or the end sought realized? Is the laborer getting more pay? No, he is anxious to go to work for the wages he had refused. Has he proved that desired ends may be gained by unlawful means? No, he

has proved exactly the opposite, and that so conclusively that the arch-conspirator himself has become converted to an advocate of lawful means and methods. And this is the lesson which the Pullman strike teaches. This strike developed, as all strikes do, into an armed force, arrayed not only against the employer, law, and order, but against honest labor as well. Those engaged in it said to capital : "You shall not do business. You shall not operate your factories or turn the wheels of commerce." And to the laboring man, hungry for bread and anxious for work : "You shall not work, we will not permit you. When we have won this strike, you shall not work, because then we will fill all positions ourselves."

Mr. Grant says : "In striking against such a despotism as exists at Pullman, Debs and his followers have simply erected the first great finger-post of our time that distinctly points to the freedom and emancipation of the whole American people." "Freedom and emancipation" from what? Which part of the American people are to secure this freedom and emancipation? Is it the thousands of honest men who desired to work, but did not have "freedom" to work because an armed mob forbade it? Is this freedom and emancipation to come to those working-women at Pullman who have to be guarded by the police on their way to and from their work—protecting from the fury of those striking for "freedom and emancipation"?

What the country needs and will have is "freedom and emancipation" from those scenes of shame and crime which put a free people to blush within the last few weeks. That sense of justice or freedom which permits or tacitly sanctions the punishment of the thousands of innocent for the sins of one guilty man, will be slow in gaining a recognition in this country. A body of men who have a grievance, however just, against a single individual at Pullman, seeking an outlet for their vengeance against innocent men, women, children, and dumb brutes, cannot arouse popular sympathy. Would the "despotism," "starvation," and "injustice" at Pullman have been worse had those engaged in the strike permitted trains of inno-

cent passengers to proceed a few miles farther? Would it have made those conditions harder had the mob, after refusing to permit trains to pass, permitted the passengers a drink of water in those sultry days of July, and, especially, when those passengers were willing to fill the tanks themselves, without calling on any "scab" to do it? Did the fiendish cruelty to those thousands of dumb creatures in the stockyards of Chicago tend to keep "starvation" from the door of the Pullman striker? Surely, "freedom and emancipation" from all such sickening scenes is demanded.

It is hard to fix individual responsibility for these things. After the paroxysm of passion and unreason is passed, no right-minded man, asked categorically, would answer that he approved them. The great body of workingmen of this country are honest, loyal, and law-abiding citizens. So were the people in an earlier time who engaged in "holy" wars, strifes, and persecutions. But as enlightenment, rules of right thinking and acting advanced, the old and barbarous methods ceased, while the whole trend of civilization is away from wars of all kinds.

The Pullman strike is a stupendous object lesson, teaching the people of all classes the truths: that no wrong can be set right by means of a greater wrong; that the rights of one citizen are as sacred as the rights of another; that a crime against those rights is a crime against the commonwealth; that the commonwealth, to live, must protect itself; and that the overwhelming sentiment of the sovereign people is on the side of law, order, and the equal rights of all.

I say nothing in favor of Pullman, his acts, or his disposition; possibly there is nothing to be said, but so far as the lessons are concerned it is immaterial whether he be a good or a bad man. The truth should be told and the true moral pointed from the sad and deplorable tale of the strike. It is not always easy to do this. The sympathy of all is naturally on the side of those who are the victims of greed or poverty, but good can result nowhere and to no one by permitting prejudice and sympathy to dictate, where calm reason should influence our judgments.

J. W. MASON.

OUR SILVER EXPERIMENT.

BY EDWIN MEAD.

WITH our usual disregard of natural law in the social world common in much of our legislation, we started in, some fifteen years ago, to try something new in national finance. Its recent dramatic ending is full of meaning and contains lessons worthy of the most careful attention.

When we resumed gold payments in 1879, after sixteen years' bitter experience with the evils of a depreciated paper currency, it was thought we had settled down, for a time at least, to a period of financial security and quiet. The lesson of the financial blunder of 1862 should have cautioned Congress against doubtful currency legislation; yet ere we had quite reached a port of safety from the storm caused by one financial experiment, we embark upon another. In 1862 we attempt the impossible—to make irredeemable notes as good as gold by means of government fiat—and fail. Again, in 1878 under the Bland-Allison Act, and later, in 1890, by means of the Sherman Law, we try by the use—or rather abuse—of the power of government to make an ounce of silver worth as much to-day as it was twenty years ago—and fail again. And why? For the same reason that the attempts of the perpetual motion crank end in failure. Nature will not change her laws to suit the whims of man; he must adapt himself to her conditions. Why does the mechanic, the chemist, the electrician succeed and astonish us with results? Because he works with nature, not against her. He places his machine in the currents of nature's force, and lo! the work is done. What would we think of the engineer who disregarded the force of gravity, the expansion of gases or the power of electricity? Yet the "practical politician" does all this and more. He not only disregards the natural laws in the

business world but he ignores the existence of any such laws. We do not look for ice to melt at a temperature of zero, or steam to condense at 175 pounds pressure. We do not plant potatoes and expect to gather oranges, or sow thistles and reap a crop of wheat. Shall we sow the thistles of financial absurdity and expect to reap the wheat of national prosperity? Is the natural order of things likely to be reversed to favor our foolishness in legislation? Do we ever succeed in evading ANY of nature's laws? The union of two parts of hydrogen with one of oxygen still forms water regardless of our wish that it might make wine; two and two always make four, and though we may sometimes wish it were five, yet we have this consolation, that there is no chance of its becoming only three. As we thus find an immutable order of things throughout the physical universe, is it at all probable that chance or the caprice of mankind governs the course of events in the business world?

In 1878 we began to inject two million dollars' worth of silver into our currency each month. In 1890, finding the nation still survived, we doubled the dose. Late in 1893 we seem to have reached the saturation point, when stern necessity, in the form of a financial panic, compelled a cessation of silver purchases. It is curious to note that while the law of 1878 was a substitute for a free coinage measure presented by a Democratic House, the act of 1890 was a substitute for a free coinage bill passed by a Republican Senate; so that honors are about equally divided between both Houses and both political parties. If it is difficult to exactly locate the responsibility for these two silver laws, it is even more difficult to see wherein the condition of the currency demanded them, as the trade of the country has been able to keep less than one silver dollar per capita in circulation. It was said of the Sherman Act—by Senator Sherman himself—that it was a compromise to avoid something worse—unlimited coinage of silver. Such excuse is hardly valid, however, considering the hostility of the president to any free coinage law, and as the House had voted against such a measure it was hardly possible to find the requisite majority to pass it over a veto. President Hayes disapproved the silver act of 1878—

greatly to his honor—but Congress persisted in its foolishness by passing it over his veto.

Recent events seem to confirm the idea that our silver experiment was the resultant of two forces—fiatism and protection. According to our vicious policy of aiding all sorts of enterprises by the assistance of government, it was said we should “recognize the silver interest,” and so we started in to buy silver. Though hardly entitled to the name of “infant industry,” yet the “friends of silver” demanded “recognition,” and it was given. Again, in 1890, when the cause of protection seemed to require the passage of the McKinley Act, the silverites took occasion to make further demands, and these also were granted—for a consideration—the support of the McKinley Tariff Act.

Though the above charge has often been denied in the past, denials will hardly be in good form since the open confession made during the late extra session of Congress. Senator Wolcott, of Colorado, stated candidly that, if the Silver Purchase Law be repealed, he was unable to see how other interests could consistently demand protection or expect support from the members from the silver states.

In opposing repeal, Senator Cameron, of Pennsylvania, even went further and offered to make a bargain with the silverites—to maintain silver purchases provided they would in turn help to preserve the existing tariff laws. Though Mr. Cameron was severely criticised—even by his own party—the cause of industrial freedom may thank him for such open confession, for thus by the utterances of “its friends,” protection stands condemned and its pernicious methods exposed to public view.

The delusion of fiat money comes in for a large share of responsibility for our financial troubles. When in 1874 President Grant vetoed a monstrous bill for the inflation of the currency, it was hoped we had heard the last of fiatism, but the Populist movement has resulted in its resurrection. This delusion—like the many others of the same sort which constitute the creed of the Populists—is a legitimate descendant of the political ideas born out of our legislative action in the past. The idea that prosperity or adversity comes only through legis-

lation, that in the government "we live, move, and have our being," that government is the great physician that shall cure all social ills, is the natural progeny of the protectionist idea of government—regardless of the fact that protectionists now attempt to disown such offspring, or that the Populists claim it as exclusively their own and consider it a sort of divine revelation through their prophet, Ignatius Donnelly.

The discussion during the recent extra session of Congress demonstrated that but few members realized that the important function of money is to express value, that to act as a medium of exchange is now a secondary function, and but fewer still seemed to know just what the unit of value actually is to-day. The silverites denounced the Repeal Bill as "an attempt to abolish the double standard," an "attempt to make all debts gold debts, by establishing the gold standard," etc., etc. Many advocates of repeal—both Republicans and Democrats—spoke of being "in favor of a double standard." That the special pleaders for silver should indulge in much nonsense about the "crime of dethroning silver as a standard money" was to be expected; but that others, including some who pass for financiers, should continue to harp upon a mythical and impossible bimetallism was most humiliating. The few members, like Senator Palmer and Representative Cochran, who had the clearness of perception and the courage of their convictions to state the actual conditions that exist, seemed to be announcing a recent discovery. That gold first became the standard* and a gold dollar the unit of value as a result of the coinage laws of 1834, that gold continued to be the standard until 1862, that it again became the standard in 1879, and that all values are to-day expressed in terms of gold, appeared to be news to most members of Congress.

The course of events has placed the silverites in an embarrassing position. They are now organizing a campaign to "re-

* The term "standard of value" is here used for lack of a simple and correct expression, but we shall fail to get a clear idea of the money question unless we keep in mind the important fact that "exchange value is not an *intrinsic quality* but an *extrinsic relation*." By some fixed standard we measure time, space, or a commodity, but value is none of these. Value is the relation between commodities or services caused by their exchange, and therefore cannot be measured, though it may be expressed, and is expressed, in terms of money.

store the double standard," and only a few months ago they were fighting fiercely to "maintain the double standard," yet the Repeal Law passed November 1, 1893, made no change whatever in the standard of value. It might be well for the silver people to take an inventory of their demands and find out just "where they are at"—to borrow a classic congressional phrase.

The impotency of government fiat was well illustrated in the Coinage Act of 1873. When a paper dollar was the unit of value, this law declared that a gold dollar should thereafter be such unit. But paper continued to be the standard until 1879, when the action of the government in redeeming its paper currency in gold again made the gold dollar the unit of value. A man's notes are maintained at par by prompt redemption on demand or when due, and no other way has yet been discovered whereby a government can maintain its credit.

Laws like those of 1834 and 1862, apparently without reference to the unit of value, yet resulting in a complete change of such unit, and such laws as the act of 1873, which declare the unit of value shall be thus and so while it persists in remaining something else, might cause us to give some thought as to the ultimate results of legislation and to consider its limitations.

Above all things else in importance is the question, What shall the term, *dollar*, mean? Shall it signify 25.8 grains of standard gold worth 100 cents as now, 412 grains of standard silver worth fifty cents, a certain amount of food products as some reformers advocate, or a government note, the value of which shall depend upon the Populist appetite for anything called money? This question as to what shall be the unit of value is of the greatest moment, though most discussions hardly touch upon it and the silver party persists in ignoring it altogether.

A unit of value is, of necessity, one, as its name implies. Those who denounce a single standard are condemning the only possible standard. A theoretical "double" standard is nothing of the sort, but an alternating standard, changing from one metal to the other according to their change in value. In our

century of existence as a nation we have had three different standards—gold, silver, and paper. Under unlimited coinage of both metals, previous to 1834, our currency was of silver and a silver dollar the unit of value. By a change in the coinage ratio, in 1834, from 15 to 1 to 16 to 1—still having free coinage of both gold and silver—our currency was changed from silver to gold and a gold dollar came to be the unit of value. Again, under free and unlimited coinage, both gold and silver were banished from circulation by the immense issue of irredeemable government notes in 1862, 3, and 4, and a paper dollar, worth anywhere from forty to one hundred cents, became the unit of value. Such was our varied experience under those “righteous” coinage laws previous to 1873. Under limited coinage of silver we now have the nearest approach to actual bimetallism—both metals circulating side by side. This is possible under unlimited coinage only when the coinage ratio is exactly identical with the commercial ratio. And that was the sort of free coinage advocated by Hamilton, Jefferson, and Madison; that they favored an arbitrary ratio, regardless of the market ratio—as the silverites would have us believe—is as false as it is foolish.

With a monumental credulity that ignores all past experience, they profess to believe that unlimited coinage would now change the present coinage ratio of about 30 to 1 so as to equal the present legal ratio of 16 to 1!

From 1834 to 1873 the coinage ratio exceeded the market ratio only one half a point, yet unlimited coinage was unable to overcome that small difference. As free coinage was then powerless to lower the price of silver three cents an ounce, and previous to 1834 could not raise the price a few cents an ounce so as to equal the coinage price, is it likely that unlimited coinage could now *double* the price of silver? But it is said, “The Constitution gives Congress power to coin money and *regulate the value thereof*,” and so it reads; yet we find constitutional enactments and royal decrees are about equally successful in annulling the laws of nature. The disastrous consequence of the only attempt of Congress to “regulate the value” of money—the greenback

experiment of the war—should deter it from anything further in that line. As the government stamp does not fix the value of coin, neither does it fix the value of a government note; such note—like the note of an individual—passes at par only when redeemed on demand by its maker.

The claim that the average cost of mining an ounce of silver is still \$1.29, and the fact of the enormous increase in the output of late years in spite of a falling market, call to mind the story of the Irish landlady, who on being asked how she could afford to sell meals for twenty-five cents that cost her thirty, replied: "Begorra, I couldn't, only for the great number of 'em."

In view of this immense increase in silver production—a production that has nearly trebled in the past twenty years and increased sixty-fold since 1860, in the United States—and the fact that many important European nations have or are discarding much of their silver for a gold currency, is it surprising that the price of silver has steadily declined? Is it necessary to call up an imaginary "appreciation of gold" brought about by a "diabolical conspiracy of the gold bugs" to explain such phenomena? Elaborate tables are prepared comparing present prices of staple articles with prices of twenty years ago, endeavoring to show that "gold has appreciated fifty per cent" during that time. But the decline in prices does not correspond to any such appreciation of the unit. Where there has been a decline the range is as wide as from one to seventy-five per cent, and the price of some articles is but a small fraction of the former cost. Furthermore, prices in not a few instances have not declined but advanced.

And, finally, there can be no fair comparison between present prices and those of 1872, unless we take account of the fact that present prices are below the normal, while those of 1872 were much inflated by the speculation which started the panic of 1873. Also that prices twenty years ago were expressed in terms of depreciated greenbacks and not in gold.

The panic of 1893 demonstrated one fact most clearly: that confidence is the basis of modern business; the foundation upon which has been built the system of credits necessary to most

great transactions ; that when confidence is shaken the superstructure of credits is at once contracted, which is essentially a contraction of the circulating medium.

The recent panic showed, also, the fallacy of the per capita idea of money of the Populists. With the largest per capita volume of currency in our history, no currency was to be had, while credit was impaired. Had the volume of our currency been twice or ten times as much the result would have been the same. When confidence is restored, a few months later, by the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act, we find currency in abundance. The banks of the great financial centers have more than they can utilize ; those of New York having a larger surplus above their legal reserves than ever before in their history. Here we have two extremes under the same volume of currency which the advocates of the quantitative theory of money may explain as best they can.

But if the demands of the silverites were based on correct scientific principles and sanctioned by the highest code of ethics ; if all the claims made for it by "its friends" were politic and just, yet the cause of silver would now stand discredited. Their disgraceful attempt to use a period of financial distress as a lever to force their demands upon Congress was the greatest possible confession of weakness. By their mad endeavor to retain limited coinage until given unlimited coinage, to subvert the welfare of the nation to that of a private interest, they insured their final defeat, to which they added shame and dishonor. Had their cause been just it could well afford to wait. But their desperate frenzy gave evidence that their purpose was to injure the national integrity by debasing the unit of value to the silver standard. And as the moral question underlies all questions of policy, so the money question is not only a question of dollars and cents but a question of honesty.

During the Rebellion, when paper money had been issued until it depreciated almost to zero and all sorts of legal means resorted to for forcing it into circulation, it was remarked by one caustic observer "that Congress had tried every expedient but one—that of being honest." This was about the only thing

left untried from 1862 to 1864 in our government's foolish attempts to do business contrary to business principles, and the maintenance of national integrity is still the great political sin in the eyes of the silverites and fiatists.

Just now the plan to settle the silver question by free coinage under international agreement is much talked of again. But how is it to be brought about? No doubt if nations thought it to their interest to so combine they could easily do so. And, from all past experience, they could just as easily withdraw from such combination if their interests could be served thereby. If the theoretical bimetallists would undertake to solve these two difficulties—the difficulty of *obtaining* and of *maintaining* an international agreement—their scheme would seem somewhat more plausible. But the principles evolved from the scientific study of economics hardly encourages any such plan, which would make great business interests dependent on the arbitrary action of government. On the contrary, they demand that government shall not interfere with affairs of business—that the natural laws of trade shall be allowed full play. Such philosophy teaches us that the only wise legal measures are those that conform to these natural laws, and that all arbitrary legislation contrary to them must end in disaster.

The final ending of our silver experiment was predicted by scientific financiers long ago. Several years before the passage of the Sherman Act they warned us that the Bland-Allison Silver Purchase Law would get us into financial trouble sooner or later. Is it not about time that we recognize the fact that a natural and immutable order of things prevails in the world of business as well as in the other departments of nature? We have conceded that natural law is supreme in the great universe of matter, and after considering the long list of our financial blunders, are we not ready to admit that something beside personal greed or crazy schemes is necessary in our financial legislation? Is there not a bare possibility that the world of mind is also under the reign of natural law? And, finally, would it not be an experiment worth while to ascertain some of the natural laws of commerce and finance, and try to legislate accordingly?

EDWIN MEAD.

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF JAPAN.

BY ERNEST W. CLEMENT.

WHEN the Japanese Diet was prorogued last winter, it was given out that the government had "publicly expressed its determination to resist all anti-foreign bills." It may, therefore, be worth while to supplement that sentence with a more definite statement of the policy of the administration party in Japan with reference to the international relations. This may be ascertained from two important public documents of the most authoritative kind. Of these one is a speech delivered by Mr. Mutsu, ex-Minister to the United States and now Minister of Foreign Affairs, before the House of Representatives previous to its dissolution; the other is the reply of Count Ito, the Prime Minister, to a representation from several (38) members of the House of Peers. Both are able papers and give a clear and powerful statement of the international policy of the Japanese government.

The speech of Mr. Mutsu was inspired by several measures breathing an excessive anti-foreign spirit. The beginning of this address was a reminder that since the Restoration of 1868 the constant policy of the nation had been in the line of gradually opening the country more and more, and of extending and strengthening its international relations. Several imperial rescripts and orders concerning "friendly intercourse with foreign powers"; the increase of "the prestige of the empire"; the carrying on of foreign intercourse "in accordance with international law"; and attaining a "position of equality with other powers"—all these were quoted and emphasized.

Then followed a concise statement of the progress made by Japan within the last twenty-five years in foreign trade, in military and naval armaments, in "the extension of civil

liberty," "the improvemnt of the national institutions," the growth of intelligence, and the progress of science and art. All this marvelous advancement, made under the new foreign policy, would be endangered, and further progress hindered by anti-foreign measures, which "betray a spirit of retrogression and conservatism, not a spirit of progress and liberalism." If once the contagion of such a retrogressive spirit be caught by the people, it will surely turn the mind of the nation into false channels. Especially is it to be feared that the spirit of progress nurtured during the past quarter of a century would be weakened, if not altogether paralyzed. Then, after reviewing briefly the progress of foreign intercourse since the opening of the ports, and after showing that the government has never failed to take "*proper* measures" against any contravention of the treaties, Mr. Mutsu wisely suggests that too strict enforcement of the letter of the treaties would rebound upon the Japanese, who would find themselves similarly restricted in other countries. "Most of the treaties . . . are unilateral in their application: in other words, the various privileges enjoyed by foreigners in Japan are defined in the treaties; but the privileges granted to Japanese abroad are little if at all referred to." So that, in this matter, Japanese might lose more abroad than foreigners would lose in Japan. And especially would the Japanese lose if they should so strictly enforce the treaties that the number of foreigners* traveling in the interior and spending large sums of money, should be greatly diminished. *Argumentum ad pecuniam!*

It seems reasonable, therefore, that "foreign intercourse must be perfectly reciprocal in respect alike of severity and of accommodation." Any other policy is stigmatized as "at least a reversion to the isolation policy," and as "incompatible with the national and fundamental program of opening the country." The plans, moreover, of forcing treaty revision by making foreigners uncomfortable in Japan are characterized as "petty measures," and "a small policy," which would be "totally inefficacious." "In fact, in order to accomplish the objects of

* 9,000 in 1892.

treaty revision, it is necessary to furnish foreign powers with proof that Japan's progress and civilization truly make her in Asia an exceptionally enlightened and powerful country."

And toward the close of the speech come these forcible words: "Gentlemen, the principle governing Japan's foreign intercourse to-day must be self-respecting. She must fear no one and slight no one. She must look to enter the family of civilized and powerful nations by observing the rules of reciprocal courtesy and respect which constitute the ties that bind that family together."

Count Ito, the Bismarck of Japan, is no less emphatic in his public letter to the Peers who had issued a representation to the government *in re* the dissolution of the House of Representatives. He states that while the ministers of the crown, undaunted by past failures, are resolved to accomplish treaty revision, they are "convinced that Japan is not called upon permanently and indefinitely to sacrifice her rights by complying with the existing treaties"; that if, after proper diplomatic effort, they fail to obtain "reasonable terms" of revision, they will resort to other means, but never will have "recourse to undignified and unworthy methods"; that the advocates of anti-foreign measures had made questions of international relations serve "the petty purposes of party politics"; and that "such men must be considered triflers with the grave and important interests of the empire." And most emphatically he asserts that "the government is opposed to that pettiness which exults in the subjection of people from distant realms to vexatiously conceived inconveniences and disadvantages."

There is no uncertain sound in these trumpets. They proclaim that the present administration will countenance no backward step in the path of progress along which Japan has been proceeding; and that the Japanese must deserve, rather than demand, revision of the present unjust and galling treaties.

On March 31 it was just forty years since Commodore Perry and the representatives of the shogun signed the first treaty between the United States and Japan, and then struck the first blow on the wedge that finally split the policy of seclusion and

insulation. But forty years have made that treaty antiquated; and as "new occasions teach new duties," so new conditions deserve new treaties. There are many, both Japanese and foreigners, who would not be sorry to have the worn-out treaties declared null and void by the emperor of Japan; and to that policy the Japanese government, as hinted by Count Ito, may be driven. But so long as the treaties remain in force, the present cabinet will not allow petty restrictions to endanger international comity.

In the special elections recently held for members of the House of Representatives, the anti-foreign agitators suffered a severe defeat. The *Jiyu-to* (Radicals), who on this question support the government, increased their number from 77 to 126; and the number of administration members, together with the number of Independents who are opposed to anti-foreign agitation, will make a total of more than 150, without counting any of the doubtful. It looks, therefore, as if, in the current session of the Diet (May 12-June 1), the Ito cabinet will have a small majority in favor of its foreign policy.

Moreover, the *Japan Mail*, just at hand, brings the news that Hawaii has voluntarily surrendered her old treaty right of extra-territorial jurisdiction. A few years ago Mexico similarly relinquished those rights; and more recently Portugal by neglect forfeited the same rights. These three nations now stand on an equality with Japan in treaty privileges; and other nations ought to give Japan "simple justice" in this matter.

ERNEST W. CLEMENT.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

BY ATKINSON SCHAUMBURG, ESQ.

OF THE many heterogeneous things in politics, the opposition of woman to woman suffrage is most peculiar. In all of the discussion but one reason has been assigned by woman in opposition, and that the ambiguous "home." Without answering this by stating that many have no homes at all, and they who have, in many cases, have only dismantled hearthstones or fireless firesides, it seems to be answered by the reflection that to cast a ballot requires on an average about ten minutes in a year. More time is probably spent in shopping or in promenading. To vote, too, is not compulsory. It may be exercised or not, according to one's inclination or inability from any cause. There was never an election, and probably never will be, wherein the entire male registered list of voters cast their votes.

There is, too, no instance in the whole history of mankind of any people or race of "previous condition of servitude" who refused enfranchisement. They invariably deemed their liberties their birthrights, and the entire male portion of the African race enjoys to-day this boon of citizenship.

The other opposition comes from a few of our sex—"horrid man"—and they have assigned as a reason one quite as unreasonable as the "home." They chivalrously assert that woman is man's *inferior*, and then proceed, *petitio principii*, to assert that Shakespeare, Napoleon, Nelson, Pitt, Swift, Landseer, Tennyson, *et id omne genus*, had no equals among women, *ad infinitum* if not *ad nauseam*.

Imprimis, grant all of this, pray what has it to do with a question of political right? Joanna Baillie was called the "sister of Shakespeare," and Mrs. Hemans was esteemed the

equal of the poet laureate of her day, although that honorable distinction could not have been conferred upon her, even by a queen. Jean d'Arc was a soldier, and led an army to victory. Madame de Staël wrote "D'Allemagne," that caused Napoleon to exile her from France for fear of its effect upon the government. Rosa Bonheur was an artist of renown in animal life, and Miss Thompson in martial canvases; Charlotte Brontë and George Eliot in literature, and so on. Woman has done pretty much what man has done, and, in some instances, has done it better. But if there was no female Shakespeare, there was but one male and he an Englishman, and England did not have a Napoleon, nor France a Nelson, even had he not fought Trafalgar. The question simply is, are women—one of whom was a general in war; others who wrote in poetry, "Wallace's Invocation to Bruce"; in dramatic verse, "Constantine Palæologus, the Last of the Cæsars"; in history, "D'Allemagne"; in prose, "Jane Eyre" and "Middlemarch"; in art, "Bayard"; in animal life a "Quatre Bras," a matchless martial canvas—as entitled to suffrage as their male *confreres* or as the male monarch of ballot, say, for instance, in Tammany Hall, even? No one should be held responsible for the accident of birth that determines the sexes. There is no way, priorily, to determine to which we shall belong.

In our day, woman has not fallen to the rear in any fair contest, and doubtless would have achieved more in every walk of life had she not been handicapped from the Garden where she unselfishly handed to Adam the apple, who probably took more than one bite and left to Eve the core. In Chicago, at the World's Exposition, there was an imposing edifice known as "Woman's Building," containing evidences of almost everything that woman did on earth and something beside, including a room of their inventions, some of which man never thought of; and here there is no inequality, for at Washington the invention of a woman is as patentable as that of a man. In the business walks of life the distinction is monstrous. In this great city of New York, typewriters and stenographers, with equal accuracy and speed, receive less compensation than their

male *collaborateur*. In Maryland it required an act of the legislature to gain permission for saleswomen to sit when not waiting upon a customer.

In our day, too, Moll Pitcher, like the embattled farmers of Concord, fired the shot heard around the world. Mrs. Edwards was as great an Egyptologist as Sir Francis Bacon or Stanley, though they did more invasion. Florence Nightingale revolutionized the hospital and ambulance service of the English army from Inkermann to Sevastopol. She wore the Crimean medal, placed upon her breast by Victoria herself. Had the sovereign been a king, he, no doubt, would have held the honor in abeyance. To-day, at Charing Cross and other great infirmaries, her inventions or interventions are adopted. Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Miss Anthony are women who unquestionably are as competent to argue any question as a great many men, and more so as to some. In the city of Baltimore there is a lady of such parts, intellectually, that she aided and assisted her father who was the president of a great trunk line railway. She is a millionaire many times, with great property and other interests at stake. On election day she can, if she desires, sit at the window of her palatial home and see her colored coachman, who lives over her stable, go to the polls to vote. She gave nearly a quarter of a million dollars to the Johns Hopkins University upon the *proviso* that women should be admitted to the medical school. Ten years before a similar proposition was made to admit them to the other departments of the university, but it was not accepted. At the bench shows at the Madison Square Gardens in New York, Miss Whitney annually judges the great St. Bernards, and her judgment is accepted by every kennel in America and England.

The boy, the lunatic, the criminal, may by age, treatment, or pardon become a voter, but the woman must remain under this ban of disfranchisement, that nothing but man in the exercise of his political power can remove. How contrary to natural justice, to democracy, to republicanism! John Stuart Mill said: "There should be no pariahs, no person disqualified save by their own default. When asked, Why do women want the

ballot? answer by asking another question, Why do men want it? Why do the British workmen so urgently plead for it?" Nearly a half century since, at the Broadway Tabernacle in this city, a meeting to discuss the woman question in all of its bearings was broken up by hoodlums, and the "gentler sex" had to be escorted "home" by the police.

If any individual woman does not desire to vote she has a right to that preference, but why oppose it in others who have as much a right—the suffrage of her sex. From the onslaught made upon the proposition, one would be justified in supposing that the proper derivation of her name was wo-man. The anomalies of the question are likewise worthy of serious consideration. In many localities women are eligible to minor offices, but no member of her sex is permitted to cast a ballot for her on election day. This was the case of a lady school commissioner on Staten Island who was first defrauded of her office by the *régime* of ring rule, but was reinstated by the constituted legal authorities.

From the foregoing it won't do to talk about the amount of gray matter in their brains or the want of a reasoning faculty—although when I asked a lady friend why she opposed the suffrage she answered "because." In our sex, the ablest and broadest intellects of the present and of the past have favored this right—the petty politician of the hour, for reasons of his own, fights it. As far back as 1867, Geo. Wm. Curtis advocated it before the constitutional convention of that year, and Chauncey M. Depew to-day does the same. He signed the petition favoring it in this city.

A male poet has written :

" O woman ! in our hours of ease,
Uncertain, coy, and hard to please."

But another poet of the same sex, who lived before suffrage was heard of, wrote :

Fiat justitia, ruat cælum.

Of course it is an objection that all women shall, as all men, be invested with this right, but with it should go restricted suffrage for each sex. To vote is not a natural right. It is the

creation of modern governments to a limited or unlimited extent. It was not known under any ancient system. They who are without property, intelligence, education, and other requisites, should be debarred. The same laws will protect them in all of their natural and acquired rights, even if they do not periodically put a piece of paper, called a ballot, in a box.

ATKINSON SCHAUMBURG.

OUR MISLEADING CENSUS STATISTICS.

BY H. L. BLISS.

IN HIS recent work, "The Growth of Capital," Robert Giffen enters his "emphatic protest" against the ignorant and reckless use of statistics, saying, "country has been compared with country, and period with period, in the most reckless fashion, without any regard to the comparability of the data."

This protest of the most eminent of English statisticians as to the misuse of statistics seems most applicable to the statistical methods of the United States, and especially so to our census statistics, which have been so juggled as to defeat their proper purpose.

In a recent speech on the Wilson Bill, Mr. Reed quoted an article in the *Fortnightly Review* as showing what a foreign writer thought of the results of our tariff policy. This article was published almost entire in the *Social Economist*, an organ of the Home Market Club, as an English view of the American tariff.

The writer, Mr. J. Stephens Jeans, failing to comprehend our statistical methods, had been grossly deceived by our census statistics. Thus the foreigner is deceived, and then quoted to mislead our own people. In this article, quoted as a strong argument for protection because written by a free trader, Mr. Jeans says: "What, however, is probably most of all remarkable in the recent census return of manufactures, is the fact that between 1880 and 1890 the actual advance in wages paid in manufacturing industry had increased to a larger extent than the increase which took place in the previous thirty years. This appears to be so startling that it might be deemed to be altogether incredible, were it not supported by the sober, unbiased testimony of a census report."

Startling indeed, and as utterly false as the oft repeated asser-

tion that our census estimates of value indicate an enormous and unprecedented increase of wealth during the so-called protective period.

These census statistics of valuation have deceived not only our own people, but foreign statisticians are accepting them as reliable the world over. Vincent, the English fair-trade leader and writer, quotes them as proof of the beneficence of protection, and Mulhall quoting them, remarks: "This is a prodigious growth of wealth in thirty years, and without parallel in the history of the human race."

This "prodigious" apparent increase, like the apparent increase in wages, is but the result of a comparison of data that are utterly incomparable, the earlier estimates of value being of *assessed property only*, while the later estimates are estimates of the true value of *all* property.

Census bulletin 379, as do previous bulletins, tabulates these estimates made on entirely different basis, under the same heading as the estimated true value of all property, as follows:

TRUE VALUE OF ALL REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY.				ASSESSED VALUATION OF REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY.		
	<i>Amount.</i>	<i>Per Cap.</i>	<i>Inc. Per ct.</i>	<i>Total.</i>	<i>Per Cap.</i>	<i>Inc. Per ct.</i>
1850.....	7,135,790,228	\$308		\$6,024,666,909	\$260	
1860.....	16,159,616,058	514	126.46	12,084,560,005	384	100.58
1870.....	30,068,518,507	790	85.07	14,178,986,732	368	17.33
1880.....	43,642,000,000	870	45.14	17,139,903,495	342	20.88
1890.....	65,037,091,197	1039	49.02	25,473,173,418	407	48.62

After thus falsely stating that the estimates of true value for 1850 and 1860 are of all property it is remarked: "It is evident from the small difference between the true and assessed values in 1850, and from the entire omission of the value of unorganized territories, that no account was taken at that time of the vast area of vacant public lands or of any other property, real or personal, exempt from taxation, and the same is probably true, at least to a considerable extent, in 1860. The true valuation reported for 1870 is believed to include not only the property taxed, but also to a great extent that exempt from taxation by law, or escaping it by fraudulent evasion, but little

information as to the kinds of property included is published. The report of 1880 shows a classification of the property included, indicating a more rigorous investigation as to the values." This more rigorous investigation at the census of 1880 may be explained by the fact that the law, which previously placed with the marshals the duty of collecting the statistics and making the estimates of value, had prior to that census been so amended as to provide for the appointment of a special agent for that duty. Robert P. Porter, late Superintendent of Census, was appointed to that office, and though assessed values had increased but 20 per cent, succeeded in discovering an increase in true value of 45 per cent. In the remarks of bulletin 379 above quoted, it may be noticed that it is stated "and the same is probably true, at least to a considerable extent, in 1860." Why is it stated as probably and partly true that which is known to be certainly and entirely true, unless for the purpose of obscuring the facts? Mr. J. K. Upton, whom it is stated prepared this bulletin, also prepared bulletins 104 and 192, in which it is remarked that "prior to 1880 no attempt was made to go outside of the assessor's returns." On page 25 of the first volume of the eleventh census, Mr. Porter in his "Introduction to the Eleventh Census" also remarks: "The estimate of true value is necessarily based on data more or less incomplete and imperfect. Prior to 1880 no attempt was made to go outside of the assessor's returns." These remarks, false as to the census of 1870, illustrate the inaccuracy of statement of the present census; but if prior to either 1870 or 1880 no attempt was made to go outside of the assessor's returns, how can the valuation of 1860 be stated as the true value of *all* property? In the *Chicago Record* of November 5, 1892, was published an article by Robert P. Porter, which followed one published October 24, in the same paper, in which the writer of the present article had so conclusively demonstrated the incomparability of our census estimates of value that Mr. Porter attempted no reply, but admitted that which had been proven by inserting the remark opposite the estimates of value for 1860 and 1890 in a table which he presented: "A comparison

cannot be made; 1860 only includes estimated true value based upon assessed property." In reply to a letter calling his attention to the manner in which the public was being deceived by recently issued census bulletins regarding wealth and manufactures, and inclosing clippings from a number of papers in which the writer had criticised them, Carroll D. Wright, commissioner of labor in charge of census, under date of May 3, writes: "You are aware, of course, that all of the tabulations of the eleventh census were practically completed before I took charge of it. If there are glaring errors in it I am unable to help it because I could not retake the census. My duty is simply to bring the results out in as creditable a way as possible. I am in no way responsible for the plans of the census or the collection of statistics. I will, however, give you some points relative to the two classes of statistics to which you call attention."

Mistaking the writer's purpose, which was not to obtain information but a statement in our census reports regarding the wealth of the country conforming with the facts, and a fuller caution as to our manufacturing statistics, Col. Wright volunteers the following information: "Wealth:—The schedule issued to the United States marshals, to whom was intrusted the collection of social statistics in 1850, called among other things for a certain valuation of property, 'the true valuation of all property to be estimated at its cash value in the place where it was situated.' The returns for the true valuation for 1850 were first published in 1860, together with the returns for that census period. They are designated as 'the true or intrinsic value of property' in distinction from the assessed value, but the text says all property belonging to the state or to the United States is not included therein. In the report of 1870, specification is made that all classes of property are included in the figures of true valuation, but no details of classification are given. The values are admittedly expressed in the terms of the depreciated paper of the period, which during the census year ending May 31, 1870, was at an average discount of about twenty per cent.

"Whatever may be the inaccuracies of previous valuations, this office cannot now attempt to correct them. The figures of true valuation for 1850 and 1860, published in bulletin No. 379, are those which Supt. Walker in 1870 brought forward for comparison with like figures prepared by him for 1870, and all these figures were reproduced for similar comparison in 1880, and these figures for that and all previous decades are reproduced in bulletin 379 for comparison with figures for 1890. The explanation of figures for previous years therein made is substantially that originally published at the respective periods."

To Col. Wright's assertion that the census office cannot now attempt to correct the inaccuracies of previous valuations, it may be said that as the valuation of 1860 was of assessed property, and so stated, that the inaccuracy which requires correction is not of the earlier census, but of the present census which falsely states this valuation as of all property. Though Gen. Walker tabulated the earlier valuations with those of the census of 1870, he placed prominently on page 8, vol. 3, ninth census, a note cautioning the public against a comparison of his estimates of value with those of the previous census, and on page 3 of the same volume he remarks :

"Valuation.—That part of the social statistics schedule of 1850 which is devoted to the subject of valuation has always been understood to require :

"First.—A positive statement of real estate as *assessed* for purposes of state and local taxation.

"Second.—A positive statement of the value of personal property as *assessed* for purposes of state and local taxation.

"Third.—An estimate of the officer making the return of the true value of both species of property combined. The phraseology of the schedule in this matter is most unfortunate, but it has always been understood (interpreted is hardly the word) to mean what is given above."

Gen. Walker then further explains that he had interpreted the law as requiring an estimate of the true value of all property. That Gen. Walker was not mistaken is conclusively shown by the statement of the superintendent of the eighth

census (1860), found on page 294 of volume of Mortality and Miscellaneous Statistics: "The marshals of the United States were directed to obtain from the records of the states and territories respectively, an account of the value of real and personal estate as assessed for taxation. Instruction was given these officers to add the proper amounts to the assessments so that the returns should represent as well the true or intrinsic value, as the inadequate sum generally attached to property for taxable purposes. . . . It must be borne in mind that the value of all taxable property was returned, including that of foreigners as well as natives, while all was omitted belonging to the United States." These remarks seem plain, yet, notwithstanding them, the marshals' estimate, \$16,159,616,068, is universally quoted as representing the true value of all property at the census of 1860. Mr. Blaine so quoted them in his letter accepting the presidential nomination in 1884, and Mr. Reid, accepting the vice-presidential nomination, quotes Mr. Blaine's letter with his false statistics as "a masterly public paper," and this falsehood has been iterated and reiterated by McKinley, Harrison, and nearly all the lesser lights of protection. It appears in Mr. Blaine's "Twenty Years of Congress," and again in his reply to Gladstone (*North American Review*, January, 1890), in which article Mr. Blaine compared the increase of wealth shown by our census statistics with that shown for the United Kingdom by statistics which he audaciously manufactured, and attributed to the English statistician Giffen.

Discovering the fraudulent character of the statistics which Mr. Blaine presented for the United Kingdom, the writer was led to investigate the census statistics which he also presented, and was amazed to discover the extent to which our people were being humbugged by statistics. He has been no less amazed that one possessing Col. Wright's reputation for fairness should refuse to correct so palpable an error. To accomplish this, it is only necessary that the valuation of 1850 and 1860 should be tabulated with the later valuations under separate headings, as the value of assessed property and the value of all property. This would more plainly indicate the incomparability of the

different valuations than explanatory remarks, which experience shows are not heeded. An investigation as to the true value of property in 1860 having been made by a statistician who was placed as special agent in charge of statistics of wealth of the present census, because of his eminent ability displayed in this very investigation, it seems strange also that the results of this investigation have not been given to the public by the census bureau. After a most extended and painstaking investigation, Fred C. Waite, late special agent of census, demonstrated to the satisfaction of other statisticians, including Supt. Porter, that the true value of all property at the census of 1860 could not have been less than \$25,000,000,000, exclusive of slave values.

Regarding the manufacturing statistics, Col. Wright in his letter says: "The fact that a number of industries are included in the eleventh census that were omitted or neglected at the tenth, cannot lessen the value of the figures for 1890. Omitting these industries for 1890, the figures for the censuses can be used for comparison (certainly in a rough way). The figures reported for the two censuses are comparable in every particular, except in so far as the schedule used at 1890 has obtained a more complete and full report. While the adoption of such a schedule was unfortunate, if the desire was to obtain only such figures as could be compared with 1880, it was a step in advance, and has resulted in obtaining a more complete report of the mechanical and manufacturing industries than shown by any previous census. The canvass of the principal cities was undoubtedly more thorough than at 1880, but on the other hand it is believed the canvass of the rural districts was more complete at 1880 than at 1890. It therefore cannot be said that the entire canvass of 1890 was more complete than at 1880. It is probable the more thorough canvass of cities at 1890 has resulted in a large showing for such industries as masonry, carpentering, plumbing, painting, and paper hanging, referred to by you. Undoubtedly a number of establishments were omitted in the canvass of both censuses. . . . The inclusion in the schedule of separate questions concerning the number and

salary of officers, firm members, and clerks has without doubt resulted in obtaining a more complete report of these classes, but it cannot be said that they were entirely omitted in 1880, because the schedules used for some of the textile industries had separate questions for these classes. It is true, however, that in the large majority of industries, officers, firm members, and clerks were only reported where the manufacturer considered they should be included, in answer to the question, 'Greatest number of hands employed at any one time during the year?' and 'Average number of hands employed?' The schedule of 1890 also has separate questions concerning piece work, and this may have resulted in a more full report of that class of employees. . . . The criticism that 'explanatory remarks count for little as the figures only are taken,' seems to be trivial; all statistical data must be accompanied with explanation, and any one attempting to use the figures should give such explanation careful study. There is nothing to warrant the conclusion that in organizing the eleventh census the schedule for the statistics of manufactures was drafted with the intention of collecting statistics that would be misleading." The writer's criticism that explanatory remarks count for little, cannot be trivial if true, and the fact that our census figures are universally quoted in utter disregard of the remarks substantiate its truth. Col. Wright asserts that "the figures reported at the two censuses for the same industries are comparable in every particular, *except in so far as the schedule used in 1890 has obtained a more complete and full report.*" That is precisely the point; as in the statistics of valuation a comparison of the earlier valuation, representing little more than half the wealth of the country, with the later valuations, which are a full if not an exaggerated valuation of the entire wealth, indicates an increase which has no foundation in fact, so a comparison of the incomplete showing of the earlier manufacturing statistics with the fuller showing of the present census is grossly misleading. As to the inclusion of the employer and officers of corporations as wage-earners, while it is true that in the cotton goods industry 2,115 officers and clerks were included in the enumeration as em-

ployees, their salaries were not included in the wage account nor were they included in the number of operatives. (See page 1125, vol. 2, Compendium Tenth Census.)

In the present census not only are salaries of officers and clerks included in the wage account, but also the estimated value of the services of the employer. Such inclusion, together with the inclusion of a far larger proportion of the higher paid city mechanics, can have no other effect than to greatly increase the apparent average of wages.

On page 704, part 2, Compendium Eleventh Census, it is remarked: "No previous census of the United States obtained so complete reports regarding such trades as masonry, carpentering, blacksmithing, cooperage, painting, plumbing, and similar trades using machinery to a limited extent." Referring to the tables we find enumerated at the tenth and eleventh censuses:

	1880	1890
Carpenters.....	54,138	140,120
Plumbers.....	9,684	42,583
Painters and paper hangers.....	17,711	56,281
Plasterers.....		10,624
Masonry (brick and stone).....	16,020	108,405

We have here in five occupations an increase of 265 per cent, with an increase in population of 25 per cent. A similar increase, though somewhat less marked, we find in similar employments. In these occupations, wages as reported average 50 per cent higher than in other occupations. We find besides reported 461,049 employers, clerks, and officers of corporations whose average wages as reported are nearly double the average wages of other employees. Evidently no fair comparison can be made of these statistics. Possibly there was no intention to mislead, and, as Col. Wright declares, "the schedule was evidently drafted with the desire to obtain a complete report of the mechanical and manufacturing industries." If so, it seems strange that lower paid industries, that are as truly mechanical or manufacturing as applying paint or hanging paper, have been so entirely neglected. If, instead of including a million of higher paid city employees not previously enumerated, Mr. Porter had included a like number of farm laborers, who use

machinery to a larger extent than painters, plumbers, and plasterers, he might have succeeded in showing a large decrease instead of a large increase in the average of wages.

It does not seem strange that Col. Wright declares, "I am in no way responsible for the plans of the census or the collection of statistics," for to indorse them would be to condemn the work of the Labor Bureau. Mr. Porter's statistics indicate an increase of wages from 1880 to 1890 of 39 per cent. The investigations of Col. Wright's bureau, as shown in the report of the Senate finance committee regarding prices and wages, indicate an increase in the average of wages for the same period of 12.3 per cent. By that report it appears also that from 1872, the year preceding our most disastrous panic, to 1890 wages had increased (gold value) 4 per cent, while from 1872 to 1880 there was a decrease of 6 per cent. Thus a large part of the increase from 1880 to 1890 was but a recovery from the fall during the preceding decade. For the thirty years, 1850-1880, wages increased 52.64 per cent, while from 1846, when the revenue tariff commenced, to 1872, wages increased 70 per cent.* Let Col. Wright, if he can and so desires, reconcile his statistics with those of Mr. Porter intended to exemplify the beauties of protection.

The character of Mr. Porter's census is perhaps best illustrated in the showing of capital invested. Gas, illuminating and heating, for Chicago shows a capital of \$40,857,246, which is pretty well understood in Chicago is from three to four times the actual *bona fide* investment of the gas trust. On this capital, the profits indicated are 5 per cent.

Taking the cotton goods industry as an example of the reliability of these statistics, we find in census bulletin 249 the statistics of four cotton goods establishments located at Manchester,

* We have here quoted the simple average. Averaged according to the statistician's estimate of importance, the Senate report indicates an increase from 1880 to 1890 of 17 per cent and from 1872 to 1890 of not quite 10 per cent. From 1846 to 1872 the increase shown is 72 per cent.

Neither our census reports nor the investigations of the Department of Labor take any account of our most important industry, agriculture.

Nine thorough investigations regarding farm wages have been made by the statistician of the Department of Agriculture.

These investigations show that while wages increased 50 per cent from 1860 to 1886, that there was after that a fall offsetting 46 of the 50 per cent increase, leaving a net increase from 1860 to 1892 of but 4 per cent.

N. H. (We take the bulletins of cities because only in them is given the detailed account of expenses from which may be ascertained the interest account.) These establishments have a reported aggregate capital of \$14,017,554; plant, \$7,410,360; live assets, \$6,434,944; and an interest account included in miscellaneous expenses of \$135,748, with a product of \$10,957,219. At five per cent the amount paid as interest would pay for the use of \$2,714,960, which, added to the active capital, makes a total active capital of \$9,149,904 required for the handling of \$10,957,219 of product.

Five cotton goods establishments in Holyoke, Mass. (bulletin 286), report an active capital of \$2,992,022 and an interest account of \$104,634, indicating borrowed capital to the amount of \$2,092,680, making a total live capital of \$5,084,702 required for the handling \$4,392,722 of product. Cotton goods are staple and sold largely on orders and for cash and seldom on long time. Those well informed regarding the business state that the active capital should be turned over at least five times in a year. This being so, it would require but \$878,544 to handle the latter product, showing that over \$4,200,000 of this reported capital is mythical. As to the amount of water in the capital reported as invested in plant, we have no means of computing. The capital reported in the building trades seems even more absurdly out of proportion to the product.

The estimates of capital are evidently based on profits and to a large extent represent the value of the power to plunder possessed by the trusts and combines that have waxed numerous and powerful. Should footpads form a trust and float their securities, based on prospective plunder and no outlay save for burglars' tools and the corruption fund necessary to convince our legislative and executive officers that their trust, as has been said of other trusts, is a private matter with which they have no right to interfere, we should have capital of the same character as much of the alleged capital included in our census reports. Of this mythical character is much of our boasted increase of wealth.

By this over capitalization apparent profits are diminished,

while figures as to wages are so juggled as to make it appear that the wage-earner reaps the benefit of our present economic system. In showing how the apparent average of wages has been increased through the inclusion of a larger proportion of those engaged in the higher paid industries, we have quoted wages as reported. The figures, however, are delusive. It is not true that these industries pay so much better than others.

The census reports give "total of wages" and "average number of employees"—to divide the former by the latter does not correctly indicate the average earnings; for the total of wages are the earnings of the whole, and not of the average number of employees. In factories where employment is steady there is little difference, but in the building trades, in which but a small proportion of those employed can count on steady work for the entire year, the difference is material. In the busy season all may be employed at the highest wages, while for a part of the year but few find employment and at reduced wages.

To illustrate: A painting and paper hanging establishment may employ 100 men for one hundred days at \$3.00 per day; 60 men another hundred days at \$2.50, and ten men another hundred days at \$2.00. This would make the total of wages for 300 days, \$47,000 and the average number of employees $56\frac{2}{3}$. Dividing the total of wages by the average number employed, we have an apparent average of earnings of \$829. As, however, there are 100 employees instead of $56\frac{2}{3}$, the correct average earnings would be \$470, making a vast difference to the wage-earner, if not to the statistician. Though the above is not an attempt to estimate the average employment, it is probably nearer the truth than might be supposed.

While these juggled statistics fail to deceive wage-earners who know from bitter experience how false they are, they do deceive others who are often disposed to condemn the discontent of those whom they are led to believe are well paid. Could the wage-earner discover in his pocket the increased wages that alleged statisticians are able to show on paper, there would be less discontent because less misery.

H. L. BLISS.

ECONOMIC COÖPERATION—A REPLY.

BY STOUGHTON COOLEY, ESQ.

THE article in the September JOURNAL by E. M. Burchard, in answer to my article in the June number, is but another illustration of the charge originally made, that the seekers after coöperation do not know that which they seek. Having in some way become possessed of the idea that nature is illogical, and natural law unjust, these would-be reformers have undertaken to supersede the natural order by one of their own.

It will be remembered that the original proposition was that we have at present a perfect system of coöperation, an ideal system in fact, barring the element of monopoly. That is, if the element of monopoly, that peculiar property granted to some of the citizens to the exclusion of others, be eliminated, the producers of to-day will get all they produce, and the whole system of production will be carried on under natural law which makes a just return to each and all.

In answer to this Mr. Burchard says: "Man has always produced wealth with his nobility and exchanged it with his meanness." In other words, his charge is that man seeks in his nobility to wring from nature all he can in production, while in his meanness he seeks to wring from his fellows all he can in exchange for what he has produced. Man can be trusted to produce wealth but not to exchange it. Hence the proposition is made that the wealth when produced shall be valued by some person or board appointed by the government, or by the people, and exchange currency issued therefor. The goods so appraised shall be stored in government warehouses subject to the demand of the holders of the certificates.

All this confusion comes from a lack of understanding of the true nature of production. Goods are not produced till they

are placed in the hands of the consumers; and every person who in any way contributes toward that end is to that extent a producer in the true sense of the word. When the farmer digs his potatoes he is producing them as much as when he plants or hoes them. And when he hauls them to market he is producing them in the same sense that he did when he planted them. The potatoes are no more use in the farmer's field or bin than they are in the ground; they must be put in the hands of the consumer before they are of any service to him. If the farmer is so far from the market that it is inconvenient for him to raise the potatoes and market them too, and he calls in the services of another who will give all his time to hauling the potatoes to market, that other is producing the potatoes just as the farmer is. If one tills the ground all the time, and the other gives his time to hauling the produce to and from the market, the case is the same as it would be if each tilled the ground part of the time and hauled to market part of the time. Neither can be said to be of more consequence than the other. By delivering his own potatoes the farmer can compel the teamster to raise his own potatoes; by raising potatoes himself the teamster can compel the farmer to deliver his own. Here we have coöperation, if they work together at all. These two realize that by giving their attention each to one thing, and exchanging with the other, they are better off than if each worked for himself alone. Now what shall be the basis of trade between these two coöperators? Manifestly it must be the half of the mutual gain. If either tries to exact more the other will refuse to coöperate.

This is service at cost. Cost as here used has its simple dictionary meaning, the effort given to secure certain benefits. But suppose the element of monopoly be introduced—as is actually the case. Suppose the teamster had the sole right to the use of the road. Then when it came to the making of terms with the farmer the latter would be compelled to accept whatever terms the teamster offered. For not only would he be unable to haul his potatoes to market on the teamster's road, but his potatoes would be of no use to him at all. The limit of

the charge which the teamster could make would be the amount which the farmer would rather give than starve. The actual charge would be that which would leave the farmer enough to keep him in good working condition. Or suppose the monopoly to be on the other side. Suppose the farmer owns all the farm land. The teamster is then the victim. As he can not raise potatoes except on the farmer's land he must yield to the terms demanded. And those terms will be, as in the other case, such as will allow the victim to maintain himself in good condition. In the natural order, where each has an equal right to the use of the earth, or the road, which is simply the way to the earth, there can be no injury to either, for the reason that either can appeal from the demand and do his own service. So that in comparing their services each can enumerate only those efforts which have actually been performed. But if the teamster owns the road or the farmer owns the land, the one who is thus advantageously placed can demand of the other not only pay for the services he has rendered, but also pay for the monopoly. This is the difference between service at cost, as it should be, and service at cost plus monopoly, as it actually is.

This simple illustration will serve for the multifarious duties of society. We can divide the farmer's interests into all the various forms of primary production, including mining and manufacturing. We can subdivide the teamster's interests into their various parts, such as the railroads, the merchants, commission merchants, bankers, etc. All industry can be divided into the two forms of primary production and secondary production. Primary production consists in bringing forth wealth from the earth and fashioning the materials as desired. The secondary production consists in exchange, in gathering the wealth into central storehouses and then distributing it to the consumers. It is as idle to say that one form of production is more important than another as to say that smelting furnaces are more important than rolling mills. Pig iron is of no use unless it be subsequently worked into shape; nor is the finished iron possible without the smelting furnace. There is never any difficulty in making terms between the real producers of

wealth. There is always a common interest between the primary and the secondary forms of production. Each must yield to the other part of the advantage of the coöperation, else the injured one will refuse to participate. Should any cause other than that of monopoly give to one class an undue share in the increase, members of the other class would begin to change their calling till competition reduced the excessive shares to a level.

From the time of the earliest speculations of the nature of the creation of wealth there has been a large class of conservatives who have held that the only producers of wealth are those who actually dig it from the earth and fashion the materials into shape; that persons engaged in commerce or trade are parasites preying upon the real producers. But it must be apparent after a moment's reflection that any one who assists the primary producer is a party to the production. The farmer's wife by cooking his meals and mending his clothes enables him to give that much more time to the raising of potatoes; and she may truly be said to be a party to the act of raising potatoes to the extent she enables the farmer to work in the field instead of cooking his meals, mending his clothes, or keeping his house in order. The same is true of the teamster who delivers the potatoes, and it is true of the teamster's wife when she enables him to keep the road by preparing for him his meals and performing all the offices which fall to the lot of woman. The potatoes are produced only when delivered to the consumer, and every one who has been a party to the act is a producer of the potatoes. As there is no difference between the interests of the producers, so there is no difference in the incentives to honesty or dishonesty. The philosophers who thought those engaged in the primary forms of production were the only real producers, inculcated at the same time the idea that they embraced all the virtue. The traders from time immemorial have been looked upon by those who were not traders as a dishonest class; they were in fact, as the state socialists claim, engaged in an occupation whose every incentive was toward dishonesty.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. If comparisons were possible it would be found that the farmers are the most dishonest class of people engaged in production. Men are dishonest because they are ignorant of the effects of wrong-doing, or because they are the victims of oppression; and as farmers have less advantages in the way of learning than other classes, and as they are common prey to all monopolies, it is but natural that they should be least guided by the canons of morality. It is not, however, with the actual dishonesty we are dealing, but the incentives to dishonesty. All wealth is the result of labor applied to the natural elements; and it is not only a natural but a wise and just law of nature which prompts man to seek to secure the greatest possible amount of wealth with the least possible amount of labor. Men do not labor for the sake of laboring, but for the sake of the wealth which labor produces. And as labor is a sacrifice of energy, the less we give for a certain result the more is our gain. Whether or not a man is to save his efforts by devising better methods of labor, or by stealing from his neighbor, is a matter of morals. There is always the incentive to steal, and there is likewise the incentive to devise new ways of production; which prevails must always depend upon the man. But man's nobleness is no more displayed by delving in the earth than in driving a wagon, nor is his meanness more apparent in conducting a shop than in digging coal. The man who as a commission merchant manipulates prices of produce to the injury of his customers, is but the companion of the farmer who plants pumpkins among his watermelons in order that the pollen of the former may mix with the latter, thus giving the melon the keeping qualities of the pumpkin, though robbing it of its sweetness. The banker who shaves notes overly fine is but the companion of the farmer who sells frosted potatoes. The merchant who misrepresents his goods is but the fellow of the farmer who misrepresents his. We cannot say that the one is more dishonest than the other, or that the occupation of the one gives more opportunities or inducements for dishonesty than the other. And so far from the government inspector's or appraiser's action removing the in-

centive or opportunity for dishonesty on the part of the producer, we know government inspectors and appraisers to be less efficient than private ones. Meat which the Jewish inspector condemns at the Chicago packing houses is accepted by the city inspectors.

Starving men will always steal, no matter what may be their calling in life. And just as men are pressed toward the limits of subsistence their disposition to steal grows. The farmer and the teamster if left alone will have little disposition to steal. Neither will care to wrong the other, not only because he knows it to be immoral but because the other can escape the act by refraining from having intercourse with him. But the teamster with the monopoly of the road immediately begets in the farmer a desire to retaliate in some way, and as he cannot appeal to force he must resort to cunning. This is the situation to-day. Monopoly has taken from the producers so much that the latter are constantly trying by dishonest means to get what honest means should give them.

It is because civilization tries to "supersede the natural law of human conduct by legal enactments" that all the trouble has come upon us. Man cannot make laws. He can only discover nature's laws and give them expression. To attempt to suspend the law of competition is as futile as to attempt to arrest the law of gravity. Nor is there more reason for suspending the law of competition because some man has been defrauded by cunning than it would be to suspend the law of gravity because a sick man had not strength enough in his legs to bear the weight of his body. The state socialist says the man who raises potatoes and the man who makes a spade cannot be trusted to exchange them because each will try to get the better part of the bargain. True, each wishes to get as much as possible for what he has to exchange, but he can get no more than the other is willing to give. True, each wishes to place a high valuation upon his own products and a low valuation upon his neighbor's, but neither will accept the valuation till it is mutually satisfactory. Because men instinctively feel that they must secure all they can for a given effort, the state socialist proposes to have

the community appoint one man, or set of men, to determine the value of the products of labor. The proposition is as absurd as to attempt to fix the specific gravity of the various forms of matter. What does a well-paid official in a comfortable office know of the value of potatoes? What does he know of the labor necessary to produce them? What does any man know of the cost of production save the man who gave the effort? What man can know the worth of my labor, or how much of it shall be given for a day's time of my neighbor's? Who can determine except my neighbor and myself? Who has any right to decide, save my neighbor and myself? My labor is mine and his labor is his. If we wish to exchange we do so, if we do not wish to exchange we do not. Who in all the broad creation has the right to step in and say that we shall or shall not exchange, or upon what terms it shall be done?

There is but one legitimate primary function of government, that of maintaining order. When order is preserved, when any citizen is prevented from imposing upon another, when he is prevented from taking from another anything against his will, the imperative duties of government have been discharged. The police power must be exercised to prevent disturbances of the peace. The right to the use of the earth must be maintained, because men have that right through the fact of being. The highways, whether they be railroads or common roads, must belong to all, else the right to the land will be barren. The land is the property of the whole people because it is a natural element like man himself, and without the land man cannot exist. The highways must be public and free to all or the people cannot get to the land. Question may be raised as to how these common rights are to be exercised, but no thinking person can question the right itself. In looking to the end it is always best to take the simplest means which will accomplish the desired result. Hence if the government takes economic rent in the shape of taxation, *i. e.*, if that value which attaches to land through the growth of population regardless of the improvements—a value, which, being due to the industry of all the people, belongs to all the people—if this be taken for taxes and

expended in maintaining necessary government service it will go to all alike. And at the same time it will be sufficient to defray government expenses and free all products of individual labor from taxation. And if in addition to this the government destroys the monopoly of transportation and those other forms of industry which depend upon franchises and are of their nature monopolies, the citizen will enjoy all his rights.

The laborer is indeed robbed to-day. He must give of his toil for the privilege of living on the earth, simply because he was born at a later day than the person who "owns" the land in question. And having made terms with the landlord for permission to raise his potatoes, he must satisfy the man who owns the highway over which the potatoes must be taken to market. There is no difficulty about the farmer and the manufacturer determining to their mutual satisfaction how many potatoes shall be given for a spade. But there is the utmost difficulty in the manufacturer making just terms with the man who owns the iron-bearing earth. The mineral land known to exist is a fixed quantity, and as the demands of society increase, the holders of the land continue to advance the price. So there is the utmost difficulty in the farmer's making just terms with the railroad, because there is but one available and he must accept its terms or do without. The monopoly which prevents competition is the cause of all the mischief, and not the competition itself. Civilized society is everywhere run in the natural order except as regards the monopolies which have been granted to favored ones. The only persons who have any right to place a value upon a thing or to say what shall be done with it are those who produced it; and the valuation must be mutually satisfactory or the trade will not be made.

The charge is made by the state socialists that modern society is breaking down because of the law of competition. This is not true. Breaking down modern society undoubtedly is, and if a change is not soon made it will be in a state of utter chaos; this, however, is due not to competition but to the lack of it. Never since land was reduced to private ownership, or public functions discharged by private citizens, has there been free competition

or freedom of contract. Every transaction which takes place within the pale of civilized society must pay toll to monopoly. Wherever two producers, free and independent persons, come together with wealth created by their own labor, they must submit to the blackmail of monopoly before they are permitted to transact any business. Not only are they always a prey to this monopoly, but the monopoly is of such a nature that it increases as their ability to pay increases, so that, notwithstanding the immense improvements which have been made by the genius and industry of man, his lot is little if any better than it was centuries ago. Men undertake to make a stove. One agrees to dig the ore, another smelts the ore, another molds the iron, and another puts the parts together and finishes it. The whole number of stoves is divided among the men in a mutually arranged proportion. This is the natural process of production; this is coöperation. But men in their ignorance have enacted laws which permit some men to own the ore-bearing land as though they had made it; and others are permitted to own the road running between the mine and the foundry. The owner of the mine gives no labor toward producing the stove; he merely gives the miner permission to dig the ore on condition that some of the stoves be given him. The owner of the road, the man who has a franchise giving him the exclusive right to have a road in that part of the country, gives no labor to the making of the stoves; he allows other laborers to make the road for him, and to use it when made, in consideration of a certain number of stoves being paid him. Under free conditions no one and no part of the men can deprive another of his just share of the coöperation. If such attempt be made he will work for himself, or in conjunction with others who will treat him fairly. But when the mineral is owned by one man and the road to it is owned by another, there is no recourse but to submit to the demands of the monopolists. Men may and do try to overcome the disadvantage they are under by working harder, and by inventing new processes of manufacturing in order that they may pay the landlord his charge and still have enough left. But this must always be a futile effort. The

charge of the landlord, like that of all monopolists, is not gauged by the service rendered but by what the victim can pay. All monopoly is based upon the principle of charging "all the traffic will bear." And as landowners have an absolute monopoly and railroads an almost absolute monopoly, their charges are such that society has been brought to the verge of disruption.

The remedy lies not in destroying the competition we now have, but in establishing absolutely free competition. Nor is this a difficult task. All that is necessary to be done is to destroy the monopolies which the laws foster. The railroads must be made as public and impartial in their service as the postal department, or as the common roads and streets. If the government can take charge of a railroad which the directors have ruined, and after a few years' management by the court's receiver, restore it to sound financial condition, it is safe to assume that it can manage the roads which are not financially embarrassed to begin with. The treatment of the land is even simpler. The taxes which are now levied upon improvements will be abolished gradually, but as quickly as possible, and a corresponding increase made on land values. Carefully prepared statistics show that the annual rental value of land just about equals the annual expenditure for governmental service. Hence to take the annual rental value of the land in the shape of a tax would not only provide ample revenue for the use of the government—local, state, and national—but it would change the whole nature of land-ownership. Since the increasing value which comes from the growth of population would be turned into the public treasury as fast as it appeared, there would be no advantage in owning land except for use. Land speculation would disappear just as slave speculation has disappeared. The large quantities of vacant land in city and country, amounting to a vastly greater quantity than that in use, would either be put to use by the owners or abandoned. All the land in use by individuals would contribute to society the annual value which society confers upon it; the abandoned land would serve as an outlet to the future increase

of population. Upon this free land any one could enter and make a good living; for it would not be the so-called free land of the far West which we now speak of, but the unused lands which lie near the centers of population—lands which are of immense productivity. Free access to this land would set a high standard of wages. So long as labor had access to this land, capital would have to offer such good terms to labor to keep it in the shop and factory, that there would be room for nothing but the legitimate returns to capital—monopoly would disappear, and labor would coöperate under free conditions.

This simple remedy involves no overturning of present institutions, no revolution in present affairs, such as the socialists, communists, anarchists, and other unnatural reformers contemplate; but rather the fulfilment of past policies, the completion of present ideas. The remedy is easy of introduction, and it is sufficient. If the laborer has free access to the land and impartial transportation at cost, no amount of capital and no combination of his fellows can deprive him of any part of his product. The force of a planet cannot crush an eggshell unless it be pushed against something. With all monopolies destroyed labor will not be dependent upon the wisdom or integrity of a judge, board, or commission for its rights, but upon a natural law, which, if freed from man-made restrictions, will produce the same harmony in the industrial world that gravity does in the physical world.

STOUGHTON COOLEY.

THE OUTLOOK.

[Notes and comments concerning affairs of interest to intelligent and patriotic citizens. Address communications for this department to Outlook Department, American Journal of Politics, 114 Nassau Street, New York City.]

CARELESS SCHOOL WORK.—Commenting on such work, the *Milwaukee Journal* says there is too much of it to be observed. "The intelligence of the free man is the safest guarantee for his freedom. The young citizen must learn to discriminate between facts and assertions, and he must do so honestly. He is then assured against the wily arts of the demagogue who deals in fiction, and qualified to listen to the advice of the patriot who deals in facts.

"That school will fail in its mission which does not recognize the welfare of the state and the community as its highest mission, and it does miss it when it condescends to methods not in strict harmony with educational principles. Whenever superficiality is encouraged in the school the difficulties for conducting the government will increase, because the political fraud will prosper better than principle."

JUDGE COOLEY ON PRESENT CIVIC CONDITIONS.—HON. T. M. Cooley, member A. I. C., delivered a notable address before the late meeting of the American Bar Association, in which he ably reviewed present civic conditions. Judge Cooley has been requested to furnish the substance of his instructive address for publication in the next issue of this magazine.

PROF. ELY'S "SOCIALISM."—The proposed trial of Prof. Richard T. Ely, member A. I. C., of the University of Wisconsin, on the charge of teaching socialism to the students of that institution, came to an abrupt conclusion through the refusal of the principal accuser of the professor to appear in the case. This refusal was based on the ground that the investigation, as planned, could not be thorough and impartial. However that may be, we do not believe that a thorough and impartial investigation could result in anything less than the acquittal of Prof. Ely. The outcry raised against him has been for the most part of a cheap and shallow sort. Prof. Ely is a profound student along economic and sociological lines, and a man of original ideas and progressive tendencies. Like most men of this class he is somewhat ahead of the times in some of his doctrines, and is certain for this reason to be abused, misrepresented, and maligned. Time will show, as we believe, and not a far distant time either, that his teachings are in all essential points sound and wise.—*Christian Work*.

A WORD TO CHRISTIAN ENDEAVORERS.—Under this heading an article appears in the *New York Sun* of September 10, from the late president of Trinity College, N. C., as follows: "In the *Sun* of September 6 you note that the *Congregationalist* thinks that the Christian Endeavorers might hold the balance of power between the two leading political parties, and thus dominate political nominations.

"I regret that so steady a religious guide should unwittingly lead the Endeavorers into temptation. Satan once did the same thing in taking the Savior to the top of the mountain and offering to him the possibilities of dominion. I therefore consider this suggestion as pernicious as it can be in its tendency, all the more that it comes from so high a source. The real work of the society is to wield spiritual power, not to take the part of a political remnant, for which, as you say, there would no doubt be a price as soon as it came into market, as some of it must if it proceeded in this manner to redeem politics.

"The moral earnestness of the army of Endeavorers naturally impels its members to help to save society as well as individuals from its sins. But in this very enlargement of its conception of duty lies its danger—in the disposition, which the *Congregationalist* is caught encouraging, to rely upon its numerical power and its capacity to control machinery for social salvation. Its service in social or political regeneration must consist rather in adding to its already ardent and virtuous faith an intelligent understanding of the civil obligations of the Christian citizen. Therefore it seems to me that it were far better to encourage the Endeavorers, who are really a power for righteousness, to join with some non-partisan organization like the American Institute of Civics, than to suggest to them the possibility even of saving society by taking the political machinery out of the hands of one party and turning it over to the other. That would be much like swapping dollars from pocket to pocket to get rich."—*John Franklin Crowell*.

PRINCETON SOCIOLOGICAL CLUB.—Rev. George T. Purves, D.D., member A. I. C., of Princeton Theological Seminary, is president of a club composed of students of that institution organized for the discussion and investigation of sociological problems. It is the intention of the club to coöperate in the accomplishment of practical work.

CORRUPT LEGISLATION.—The editor of *Christian Work* quotes from and comments on Moorfield Storey's recent address before the State Bar Association of New York, as follows:

"Mr. Storey is a leading member of the Boston bar, and has been prominently identified for years with various civic reform movements in that city and throughout the country. He is a man of calm judgment and conservative tendencies, and his address, severe and sweeping as it is on some points, cannot be regarded as a rash and unconsidered utterance. When, therefore, Mr. Storey uses such language as the following, the situation becomes one demanding the most serious attention of all citizens who have the welfare of their country at heart:

“ ‘From the most august legislative body in the country, the Senate of the United States, down to the aldermen of New York, the citizen too often distrusts, fears, and is ashamed of his representatives. The business community throughout the country welcomes the adjournment of Congress as the end of a season filled with perplexity and dread. When a state legislature meets, every great corporation within its reach prepares for self-defense, knowing by bitter experience how hospitably attacks upon its property are received in committee and on the floor. The citizen of New York needs no light from me as to the character of the legislature. In Massachusetts, during each successive season for years, I have heard on every hand “This is the worst legislature we have ever had,” but I do not believe that Massachusetts is more unfortunate than her sisters in New England, and if the old-time virtues still exist in Pennsylvania, or Maryland, or California, or the great states of the South, the West, and the Northwest, I shall hope to learn from their representatives in this body the secrets of its preservation.’ ”

“This, as we have said, is very strong language, and there is much besides like it, but who shall say that it is not literally true? So far as our state and our own municipality is concerned, we know that the truth is only half told. The annual biographical record of our city’s legislative representatives at Albany and Washington brought out by the City Reform Club is a document that would bring a blush of shame, it seems to us, to an Ashantee savage, if the same things were said of his rulers. It reveals in the bare plain statement of facts that we are governed, so far as our city representatives are concerned, by a pack of filthy knaves—rumsellers, pothouse politicians, and other creatures of this stamp, persons whom no respectable man would think for a moment of inviting within the doors of his home. There are a few representatives not to be included in this list, but not more than four or five altogether.

“But statements of this kind have been frequently made in the past few years, and are not denied anywhere. The question is, What shall be done about it? Mr. Storcy says the remedy for the condition described lies in the citizen himself. ‘There are,’ he says, ‘three possible points of attack—the men who receive the money, the methods by which it is paid, and the men who pay it. You must raise the character of your legislators. You must strip bribery of every comfortable cloak. You must make men realize that they are themselves disgraced when they corrupt their fellows. Our self-constituted political leaders talk much about the public, but they fear nothing as much as the expression of its real opinion.’ The separation of national from state and municipal elections, the enactment of stricter laws as to bribery and other crimes against the ballot, and the possible adoption of the referendum are among the remedies which he proposes. Added to all this there must be, in our opinion, ampler and more generous provision in our systems of education for the instruction of young people in the principles of good government, and in the practical

operations of political and governmental machinery. Legislative remedies will not of themselves be effectual unless they are supplemented by the active participation of all good men in the affairs of government. More attention must be paid in our churches, our schools, and our homes to the development of genuine patriotic feeling and to inculcation of sound doctrine respecting the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of American citizenship."

THE INDIANA GOOD CITIZENSHIP LEAGUE is the title of a movement which has grown out of a meeting of Christian Endeavorers previously held for the purpose of considering the possibility of effective work for the promotion of better civic conditions. Of this body the *Congregationalist* says that "it declares war against the saloon and the political organization of saloon keepers, against gambling, social evils, and lawlessness, the corrupting influences of corporations and trusts, and against the efforts of political leaders in any and all parties to defeat the highest interests of the whole people. It will seek to arouse the spirit of good citizenship and to unite in action those who stand for a high standard of morality in political affairs. It will support honest and capable men as candidates for office, without respect to party. It will unite local bodies to carry out its purposes through committees, ascertaining the character and sentiments of candidates for political offices, and disseminating the information thus gathered.

"The difficulties which will beset such a movement as this are great. The influence of the organization will be desired by each party, claimed wherever possible, and its motives maligned by those whose plans it opposes. Those who do battle for good government in the arena of politics may expect to receive as well as give hard blows. The Good Citizenship League cannot grapple with the Saloon Keepers' Association without finding that body on its own level, and getting bespattered with the mud in which it stands. Unscrupulous but able and skilled and tireless politicians, who devote their lives to securing the prizes of office, will not be defeated by denunciations and mere declarations of good principles.

"Nevertheless the battle must be fought. It must be renewed in every generation; and there are peculiar reasons at present for entering upon an aggressive campaign, and peculiar encouragements to do this. The young people of this country hold its destinies largely in their hands. He is not a patriot who does not wish them heartily to take up political duties and is not glad to join with them in this great work. The foes which these Christian organizations propose to fight are the enemies of all good citizens. We believe that the tendency toward organized effort to purify politics is almost certain to enlist the activities of such bodies as these young people's societies, and that the results may be of great value, though they are threatened by grave perils."

AS TO MR. PULLMAN.—We take it that the attitude of the *Watchman* toward Mr. Pullman is about right, especially in view of the

testimony given by Mr. Pullman to the national investigation committee. It says: "But it is not difficult to account for the public sentiment in reference to Mr. Pullman to which we refer. It is based upon a conviction that a man has no moral right to stand upon, or seek to enforce, all his legal rights. A man owes something to the community of which he is a part, something to the men who work for him, toward whom, no matter how arrogant may be the claims of their labor unions, his attitude may well be that of *noblesse oblige*. When an employer simply stands upon his rights without the slightest exercise of tact or any special effort at conciliation or personal friendliness, when his attitude toward his workmen is simply 'Take it or leave it,' the best men in any civilized community are apt to consider that he falls short of meeting the moral requirements of his position."
—*L. A. Maynard in Christian Work.*

CIVIC COMMITTEE OF THE CHURCH.—At a recent meeting of the Congregational Clerical Union of New York and vicinity an interesting paper was read by the Rev. Doremus Scudder, M.D., member A. I. C., of Brooklyn, upon the subject of "The Civic Committee of the Church." It was a strong appeal for the church to interest itself in furthering good government in municipalities.

THREE VIEWS OF THE TARIFF LAWS.—Varying views of the new tariff laws are pretty thoroughly summarized in the following extracts from *Harper's Weekly*, *The New York Tribune*, and *The Journal of the Knights of Labor*.

"The new revenue law marks a memorable epoch in the economic history of the nation. With all its grave defects and positive errors, it must be recognized as the most valuable and significant act of our government, in its exercise of the power of taxation, during this generation. The tariff of 1846 was constructed on the principle of collecting the necessary revenue while imposing the least possible burden upon all classes of people, and without discrimination between different sets of producers. It proved so successful that the principle was confirmed, with large general reductions, in 1857, with the cordial acquiescence of the nation, and was everywhere regarded as its permanent policy. The Rebellion soon impaired its credit, and the war required greater revenues than any nation had ever collected. Those classes of producers which had access to the committees of Congress seized the opportunity to demand discriminations in their favor under the name of protection to American industry, and soon gained the control of legislation. For thirty years the combination of beneficiaries, for whom ten times their number were taxed, seemed to grow stronger, and every change made during that time in the revenue laws was devised by them to increase their profits at the cost of the great majority. This system reached its culmination in the McKinley Act of 1890, in which every scientific principle of public economy was defied, and taxes were imposed with hardly a pretense of regard for the

interests of the people at large, but solely with a view to meeting the demands of the favored producers, so far as the needs of the treasury and the patience of the much-suffering nation would permit. But the greed of the protected classes had overreached itself.

"It is proper now to consider the good and the bad features of the new tax law, and thus to justify our assertion of its value. There are three serious defects in it, as a revenue measure, which go far to counter-balance the benefits it will confer. The income tax is a weak and timid piece of class legislation, passed largely as a concession to local and to socialistic prejudices. It will expire by limitation after five years, but we confidently expect its repeal before the returns for the third year are made. Less important, only because it is a transient evil, in the speedy removal of which public opinion is resolved throughout the land, is the series of concessions made in the law to rich monopolies. The chief and type of these, the great Sugar Refining Company, has secured, through a band of senators who seem to be its agents, an indirect but real grant of the moneys of the people, the mere hope of which has in six months added fourteen millions of dollars to the market value of its stock. But its worst feature is that in the final revision of the bill by a small and secret group of senators, and even in the discussion of that revision in the open Senate, the principal considerations adduced for changes were always the interests of special classes of producers, and not those of the whole people. The protective system itself, root and branch, is at war with honest government and the people's rights.

"It is more pleasant to turn to the other side and ask what has been gained by its enactment. In the first place, the law has made certain the replenishment of the treasury, and removed all risk of a further increase in the permanent national debt. Again, it insures the cheapening, to a substantial extent, of a multitude of the necessities and comforts of life, reducing the cost of living for every household, without weakening the resources of the government. Clothing of every description, cloths, dress goods, blankets, and carpets, will be cheaper and better everywhere for its passage. Imported food, woods, and lumber, china and glassware, pocketknives and table-knives, nearly all the completed goods, the use of which is so large a part of civilized life, together with the materials of which they are made, share in the large reductions of duty. These changes alone will certainly, within a few months, make every man's daily earnings more valuable to him than now. But they will do far more than this. They will do much to revive depressed industry and to restore general prosperity. A pretense is made by a few manufacturers of anticipated distress from the reduction of certain protective duties, but for this we can find no foundation in the law. But the brightest feature of this tariff is found in the fact that it is a turning point in the history of our economic legislation. It signalizes the final stage in the most costly experiment ever tried by a peaceful nation. The experiment has failed. In the new law the nation has turned its face toward justice, toward economical truth, toward lasting

prosperity, toward ultimate freedom of trade; and the movement henceforth will be in that direction."—*Harper's Weekly*.

"Yes, the McKinley Bill is dead, as Democrats boast. But the effort to overturn the act of 1890 has already broken and defeated the Democratic party and covered it with infamy. The assault against it was led by President Cleveland, and has made him an object of contempt to his own party; by Chairman Wilson, and has exposed his pitiable incapacity; by the three confederates, Jones, Vest, and Mills, who are branded by the head of their party with perfidy and dishonor. No repeal of the act of 1890 was found possible, except by buying votes from the sugar and whisky trusts and other monopolies, and so a wild revel and witches' dance of corruption has brought disgrace upon the party in power, and in place of equal and fair protection for all has substituted the 'communism of pelf' in Mr. Cleveland's phrase, and, in the language of the *New York Times*, a 'bill packed with duties that are practically iniquitous favors sold to various monopolies in return for the votes of senators controlled by those monopolies.'

"Meanwhile the McKinley tariff stands in history as the act which raised the demand for the wages of labor to the highest point ever reached in this country—to more than \$10,000,000,000 in the aggregate, while the overthrow of that measure has already taken from labor wages amounting to \$2,000,000,000 or \$2,500,000,000 yearly. The act brought the largest volume of business and the greatest prosperity ever known, for when people earn much they buy much. The fight for its repeal has brought the worst prostration of business for fifty years. And it is all for nothing, because the bill of sale and of shame cannot last. With a dishonesty matched only by the stupidity of business men who swallowed the falsehood, partisans urged repeal as the only way of getting a settlement, but now it is confessed that nothing is settled. President Cleveland says the new bill is only 'a vantage ground from which must be waged further aggressive operations.' Chairman Wilson, in his closing speech August 13, said the bill made some 'breach in the protective system through which the hosts of American freemen would continue to march,' and that 'no work that is not thorough ever remains undisturbed.' The *New York Herald* declared August 28, the morning the bill went into operation, that it 'cannot be a finality. It is a mere makeshift.' The *Times* declared July 22 that the bill 'would be a betrayal of faith and a defiance of the public sentiment of the nation, which would immediately again be appealed to. Agitation would instantly be renewed.' All that business has gained, all that labor has gained, by enormous losses and sacrifices thus far, is a beginning of further 'aggressive operations,' further agitation, loss, and sacrifice."—*New York Tribune*.

"'We are still being protected,' says the workingman, 'and still starving.' The only difference between Republican protection and Democratic protection is that one created the trusts and the other continues their power and existence."—*Journal of the Knights of Labor*.

ÆSTHETIC LUNACY.—William Morris, the English artist and socialist, says the *Congregationalist*, is reported as saying: "Marriage is absurd under existing conditions, and the family, about which so much twaddle is talked, is hateful. Ties of blood are regarded from a wretchedly mistaken point of view. Should I care for a man who is my brother and a bore better than for a man who is not my brother and a good fellow?" The same letter from London that gives the interview with this utterance tells of Miss Frances Willard's conversion to socialism by Mr. Morris and her modest contribution of money to help on the propaganda. Now, if educated, æsthetic leaders like William Morris, at their end of the line, are going to attack the institutions of marriage and the family and decry filial and fraternal obligations of duty—if not of love—and at the same time men of lesser caliber—mental, though, perhaps, not moral—are to maintain that individual ownership and control of property and the rewards of talent or attainment are to be denied, then Western civilization is to be profoundly altered eventually—that is, supposing it is converted by the new prophets.

STATISTICS OF FAMILIES AND HOMES.—In 1890 there were 12,690,152 families or households in the country. Of these 47.8 per cent owned their homes, and of these 72.03 per cent had no incumbrance upon their properties. Of families engaged in farming there were 4,767,179, nearly 66 per cent of the farms being owned by their residents, and of these nearly 72 per cent having no incumbrances. Putting it in another way: of every 100 farm families 34 hire their farms, 47 own free of incumbrance, and 19 own subject to incumbrance. But 74.22 per cent of the incumbrance on owned farms was incurred for the purpose of buying real estate and making improvements—not for living expenses, etc. As might be expected, when we come to the towns and cities a different condition of affairs is found. In cities and towns of 8,000 to 100,000 population 35.96 per cent own their homes, and of these 65.89 per cent without incumbrance. But in the cities with more than 100,000 population each, with their 1,948,834 home families, only 22.83 per cent own their homes—93.67 per cent of the families in New York City hiring their homes, Boston coming next with 81.57 per cent, Chicago with 71.27 per cent, and Rochester, N. Y., having the smallest percentage of tenancy of any cities in the class. Of the incumbrance on farms and homes 22.50 per cent bears interest at rates less than 6 per cent; 33.44 per cent at the rate of 6 per cent; 43.36 per cent at rates greater than 6 per cent, and 10.96 per cent at rates greater than 8 per cent. The average value of each owned and incumbered farm was \$3,444, of each owned and incumbered home \$3,250, and the average incumbrance on each of the farms is \$1,224.

PRIMARIES.—Word reaches us that an effort will be made this winter in California to secure the enactment of a law that will permit of the use of the mails in primary elections. The proposed plan is to

send to every enrolled member of a party a ballot, which the voter has the right to send to his party headquarters on or before a certain date, with the names of his choice for the several office, for which candidates will be nominated, those suggested by the largest number to be declared the nominees. This is essentially the idea incorporated by the Municipal League of Philadelphia into its by-laws, which provide (1) that in choosing candidates for public office, blanket ballots prepared according to the Australian system must be used; (2) that (in the case of ward and division associations) after the executive committee has fixed the time and place of meeting for the convention, notice of the same by advertisement or mail must be given at least two weeks in advance of the primary election. This notice must contain a statement of the positions to be filled, the names suggested by the executive committee, and the address to which members may send names which they desire to have printed on the ballots; (3) that the executive committee shall print on the official ballot the names suggested by themselves and all other names, suggested by at least five members. In this way members of the League are given the fullest opportunity to secure a fair expression of their choice.

The rules of the Republican party (the dominant party) of Philadelphia give the power of fixing the time and place of elections into the hands of the campaign committee. They require that "Postal-card notices containing notice of primary elections shall be mailed by the president of each division association to all the Republican voters in said division, stating, etc." This requirement, however, is "more honored in the breach than in the observance." The same no doubt applies with equal force to the rule "that no person holding an office or employment of honor, trust, or profit under the municipal, state, or national government, or any department thereof, shall be an election officer." Only Union Republican voters are permitted to vote at the Republican primaries, and the party rules define such a voter to be one who shall have voted the Union Republican ticket for national or state officers, at the preceding national or state election. Under this definition an Independent Republican would alternately be qualified and disqualified. For instance, if in 1890 he voted for Pattison for governor, he would not be permitted to vote at the primaries for the choice of presidential delegates in 1891-2, although he intended voting the Republican presidential ticket. The laws of Pennsylvania protect primary elections and make frauds at them punishable as misdemeanors, with penalties not exceeding \$500 fine and one year's imprisonment.—*Clinton Rogers Woodruff*.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS.

NOVEMBER, 1894.

COMMERCIAL DEPRESSIONS AND BUSINESS CRISES.

BY DR. FREDERIC CLEMONS HOWE, PH.D.

THE periodic recurrence of disturbances which the business world has experienced during the past hundred years has led to a species of fatalism in many minds in regard to commercial depressions and panics. With a periodicity that can almost be predicted, the financial world has been afflicted with this sort of industrial plague from the closing days of the last century down to the present time. Without apparent cause, while mills and factories are running full hands and double time; while prices and wages are high and constantly rising; with every evidence of prosperity at hand—still, without warning, all business is likely to be brought to a standstill, mills to be closed, and thousands of men to be thrown out of employment and cast upon the streets. As a result, crises are now anticipated and looked for by the popular mind much as are earthquakes, floods, pestilences, and famines, and accepted as a sort of retributory judgment consequent upon reckless financiering or inconsiderate commercial speculation, from whose visitation permanent relief seems quite as chimerical to hope for as from the recurrence of the former manifestations of nature. Crises are in reality a sort of check-rein, holding the business world to an appreciation of the limitations of trade, restraining the undue expansion of credit, and compelling a periodic taking of stock and the renewal of business upon a hard basis.

Previous to the present century industrial crises were comparatively unknown or were so purely local in character as scarcely to merit the attention of the historian. True, during

the fourteenth century, after the visitation of the Black Plague, as well as during the closing days of the seventeenth century, as Thorold Rogers and Macaulay have so graphically described, England was afflicted with conditions which at the present day would accompany a financial depression, and at other times and in other countries the temporary failure of crops has caused great distress and suffering; but commercial convulsions, such as those of 1857, 1873, and 1893, are distinctively the result of the changes which the past century has brought about in the production and distribution of wealth, and which have been so momentous in character as to warrant for it the appellation of the "Industrial Revolution." When it is considered that the appearance of large cities, of corporations, the use of machinery and steam in production, as well as the utilization of the power so accidentally discovered by Watt in railroad and water locomotion, are the development of but little over a century, the momentous nature of the change which the world has passed through will be faintly appreciated. Scarcely more portentous to the preconceived ideas of the earth's cosmogony were the discoveries of Columbus four hundred years ago than the effects of these discoveries upon the social and economic life of mankind.

By this increased command over the powers of nature the spinning-wheel and the hand loom have been relegated to the garret or to the parlor as curios. The crossroad workshop has been supplanted by the mill and the factory, so that no longer is production based upon local and immediate demand, but the world has become a market and the laborer an impersonal automaton registering or performing some simple operation. Capital has become so concentrated and division of labor carried so far, that whereas fifty years ago every man was his own master, now thousands of men are dependent for their sustenance upon the will or caprice of one man, while several corporations can by combination control the market of a commodity. The productive power of man has increased many fold and the standard of life of the people has been steadily rising, but the new organization has been accompanied with so

many hidden germs of social and industrial evils as to induce a pessimism in many minds for the future. The factory system has induced immense congestions of population in industrial centers with all the attendant ills of city life. Division of labor has reduced the independent laborer to a mere mechanism performing the daily drudge of mechanical toil, debasing to self and little conducive to the elevation of morals or sentiment; while the factory has taken the mother and children from the home and placed them in the fetid atmosphere of a crowded room, only productive of disease and the depletion of vital energy, while the offspring, often neglected, is left to grow up the prey of vicious surroundings. This metamorphosis in the industrial world has also rendered it more delicate, more sensitive, to the least disturbance. The producing world has become an immense mechanism, whose mainspring is credit and which depends for its propelling force upon the maintenance of the harmonious relationship between production and consumption. Industrial society may be likened to a pyramid inverted upon its apex, or is not unlike the great image which the king Nebuchadnezzar saw, "whose brightness was excellent, whose head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron, part of clay"; its duration and strength seem most permanent, but its base is so insecure that the slightest touch or breath of suspicion is sufficient to crumble it to the earth.

But just as the individual workman is no longer a microcosm of the industrial world about him, producing for his own consumption and dependent upon his own community for a market, so in a like manner have nations ceased to be self-dependent and isolated, for by the perfection of the railroad, the telegraph, and the steamship, the entire world has been transformed into a market, so that the artisans of New England and Great Britain have become dependent upon the cotton fields of the South and the wheat fields of the West for their sustenance, as well as for the raw material of manufacture, from which regions the raw product can now be transported more cheaply than from portions of England less than a generation ago.

By the same forces the entire civilized world has become so closely identified in its financial interests that the slightest shock to the most distant corner of the earth is at once transmitted like an electric spark to the uttermost boundaries of the civilized world. London has become as a great financial nerve center, with dependent ganglia in New York, Paris, Vienna, and Berlin, from which points nerve tissues ramify into every mart of trade. So delicate has this organism become that, like the physical body, it suffers immediately and acutely from the slightest wound inflicted upon any of its parts, and it is this sympathetic relationship which renders financial panics at the present time so momentous in their consequences, and proves them to be independent alike of forms of government, legislation, banking or currency, protection or free trade.

The panic of 1873, for instance, began in the Vienna Stock Exchange, but did not stop until it had included in its destructive career every country in Europe, and passed like a pestilence over the length and breadth of North America. In a like manner, the stringency of 1890 had its origin in a small corner of South America, where the Baring Brothers of London had large interests, but so great was the shock which the failure of this firm had upon the money markets that capital held its breath the world over and feared for a repetition of the crisis of 1873.

In yet other ways is this cosmopolitan nature of the commercial world manifested. The introduction of triple expansion engines into steamship travel and the cheapening of freight rates in this country have placed the great wheat fields of the West in closer relationship with the manufacturing regions of Great Britain than were the rural districts of that country but a few years ago. To-day a shortage of our wheat crop is a calamity to the artisans of England, causing them to suffer extremely if the price of bread is thereby seriously affected. In a converse manner, a redundant crop upon the continent of Europe is a calamity of no mean order to our western producers, who are dependent upon this outlet for the surplus of their crops, and a temporary failure of this market may be of such

serious consequences as to induce a commercial and industrial depression in the eastern manufacturing states.

The foregoing description of the economic conditions under which we are now living, and which differ so radically from anything which our fathers knew, indicates why it is that crises come with such regularity and with such ever increasing severity in the commercial world, and completely prostrate a country, even in the midst of seeming prosperity. It will be the aim of the balance of this paper to show how panics make their appearance and the results which flow therefrom. As has before been stated, the two requisites to the smooth running of the industrial organism are a secure basis for credit and the maintenance of the proper relations between production and consumption. If the proper balance between demand and supply is destroyed, what is termed overproduction, or its equivalent underconsumption, will result and a commercial depression is likely to follow ; while if through bad legislation, careless banking, or kindred causes the monetary equipoise is disturbed, credit is likely to be annihilated and a monetary crisis precipitated. These two causes usually go hand in hand. Not that it is ever possible to ascribe a panic to one specific cause to the exclusion of other factors, for the history of a panic, as Mr. Bagehot says, is the history of the conflict of many causes, and to attempt to explain it without a knowledge of the effects of each and their relationships and dependence upon one another is like trying to explain the bursting of a boiler without understanding the theory of steam.

An industrial crisis or depression is usually preceded by a period of good times. Crops are unusually good for a series of years. The farmers are prosperous and feel that relief though long delayed has come at last for them. They buy largely, either to restock with machinery or to add greater comforts or luxuries to their homes. Often they go further and purchase more land for which they mortgage their property, and this at a time when prices are high and money is commanding good interest. Prosperity usually begins upon the great plains of the West and transmits its renewed energy into the manufacturing

East, for prosperity, like depression, is sympathetic. Business feels a Brown-Sequard elixir flowing through its veins, and the mills and factories reopen their doors if they have been closed, or increase their output if they have been running low. Capital is plenty, the banks lend freely, everybody is anxious to buy in the expectation of realizing quickly with a handsome profit. New capital is attracted into business and old establishments begin to run double turns. Railroad construction assumes unwarranted proportions, speculation is general, wages are high, money is easy, and times are flush. Just such a time as this followed upon the unusual harvest of 1891. In fact, it began as early as 1889 and received a marked impulse in 1890 by the passage of the McKinley Bill, which gave a decided stimulus to certain kinds of industry. It may seem a little paradoxical to state that the unusual home crop of 1891, the exceptional foreign demand of the same year, and the passage of the high tariff measure of 1890, are more largely responsible than any other cause for precipitating the present financial crisis, yet such is a defensible hypothesis, at least. No one will deny but that the country had a "boom" in 1890-92, that railroad construction was in excess of the needs of the country, that business was prosperous, and that the farmers were rapidly paying off their indebtedness, while labor was generally employed at high and constantly increasing wages.

We are now paying for it in forced liquidation. Business was overdone; the warehouses were overstocked with goods; the banks were loaded with commercial paper; there was a quite general glut in the market. When trade reaches such a state, everybody becomes a seller and few are inclined to buy.

A panic usually begins in a disturbance of credit on the Street. In its earliest stages it amounts to no more than a vague suspicion, which finally crystallizes into an expression of distrust and apprehension. Everybody begins to question the ability of his neighbor to pay, and thus, feeding upon itself, the distrust becomes general, and those who have obligations to meet endeavor to strengthen themselves, *i. e.*, to borrow money while they can. They go to the banker's with bills which they ordi-

narily would not have negotiated for days or weeks to come. The banks do not like to refuse to lend because it may then be said that they are in need of money and thus the suspicion will be attracted toward them. Even they, however, soon join in the scurry to increase their demand assets by calling in their loans and by declining to advance new ones. Instead of checking the panic in its incipient stages by paying out freely and thus dispelling the idea that money is "tight," the bankers and brokers join in the hue and cry and strive to increase their reserves. Such are the phenomena presented by Wall Street and the monetary centers a year since, when the present depression was in its incipency.

From this it will be seen how intimate is the relation which the monetary market sustains to the mercantile world. All merchants and manufacturers are under liabilities to pay; they have recurring bills to meet which can only be done by discounting more paper. At such a time as this they probably desire to borrow more freely than usual in order to be on the safe side in case of a panic. At such a time everybody wants money. Credit for the time being is annihilated, at least to some extent. The business world is compelled to transact its affairs upon a cash basis, and when it is appreciated that ninety-five per cent of the business of the country is done upon credit, the result of the destruction of so much efficient money will be appreciated. A panic usually arises under some such conditions as these, and puts in its appearance at some great financial center as Lombard Street in London or Wall Street in New York. It may be precipitated by the failure of some industrial undertaking in distant lands, as was the case with the Barings in 1890, who went down with the depreciation of some South American stocks in which they were largely interested. More frequently the first intimation the business world has of the trouble that is in store for it comes from the announcement of some local failure, as that of Overend, Gurney & Co., in London in 1866, or of Jay Cooke & Co., in New York in 1873. Those who remember this failure will recall that it came like a thunder clap from a clear sky, and the pall which it cast over the Street and the tremor of

distrust which it sent through the whole business world. In a few days eighteen banks followed the example by closing their doors with aggregate liabilities to depositors of \$21,000,000. From Wall Street the disaster was communicated to the outside business world. Within an incredibly short time all business was at a standstill; the Stock Exchange temporarily closed its doors; prices fell off from ten to thirty-five per cent; and remittances from city to city were almost suspended. Eighty-three railroads, representing a combined capital of two hundred and fifty millions, suspended payment, and all business came to a temporary standstill. During the following winter three million persons out of a total population of but little over forty millions were said to be idle; and all this at a time when warehouses were filled with goods, prices and wages were high, and the country apparently in a prosperous condition.

Prices then begin to fall, wages are reduced, men are thrown out of employment and clamor for work in the streets. No matter if the danger be but imaginary, the industrial mechanism is so delicate that a failure to dispel it may bring down the financial structure of a whole nation in a few weeks, prostrating the strongest houses and inducing consequences from which industry will not recover for years. We know how distrust grows, fears augment, by feeding upon themselves. Shortly the merchant heavily stocked with goods needs money to pay the jobber, the jobber must meet his obligations with the manufacturer, while the latter has dependent upon him his laborers, who must be paid, as well as the firms and producers who have furnished him with materials. The people, appreciating the situation, begin to fear for the solvency of the banks, and aggravate the conditions by demanding their money in order that they may stow it away in safe deposit vaults or in hiding; and the banks themselves thus rendered fearful of a run are compelled to decline to offer relief to their patrons. The merchant cannot now find cash to pay his bills and either goes to the wall or is granted an extension of time, while his inability to pay is aggravated when it reaches the jobber, who carries augmented consternation to the manufacturer, who is compelled to dis-

charge his employees until the market improves or cash becomes more plentiful. It is this sympathetic character of all industry which is the most characteristic thing of the present generation. A single bank failure in New York may bring down half its country dependencies, and they in turn may precipitate innumerable provincial enterprises.

This industrial solidarity is the direct result of concentration of capital, the growth of corporations, and the substitution for the former local competition, in a restricted market, of great industrial wars which have for their aim the control of the markets of the whole world. To this must be added the recent development of trusts, monopolies, and corners. The past decade has seen a development in this direction unequaled in the preceding history of the country. The example of the Standard Oil Company in securing practical control of the world's consumption of oil led ambitious financiers to the belief that what had been accomplished in one realm of production could be done in another. As a result we have had the sugar trust, the whisky trust, the copper trust, and combinations in almost every other trade for the better control of prices. The experience of the copper trust is the history of the majority of these unholy combinations. Attempting to control the markets of the world, it finally collapsed by the force of inside pressure, bringing down large affiliated interests with it. This tendency to concentration is but one of the symptoms of the changed conditions of industry, and illustrates the dependence of its various parts as well as the delicate relationship which exists within it.

The periodic recurrence of these cycles of prosperity and depression has led certain economists to formulate a law for their occurrence. That they are periodic the uninterrupted repetition every ten years from 1815 down to the present time seems to indicate, although it is by no means necessary to accept the fantastic conclusion drawn therefrom by Professor Stanley Jevons, of England, that they are dependent upon the decennial recurrence of the spots upon the disc of the sun. It is evident, however, reasoning from the past, that the industrial world will

continue to be subject to their return so long as industry is based upon the unrestrained, competitive basis, and while it by no means follows that the only avenue of escape lies through the socialistic program, there is reason to suppose that relief is to come from a somewhat similar process. Unrestrained, fierce, warlike competition, so long looked upon as the industrial cure-all, is more largely responsible than any other cause for such experiences as we are now passing through. It accounts for misapplied production, popularly called overproduction; it destroys the harmony between production and consumption, which, as was stated above, is a prime cause of financial depression. Combination and coöperation are the characteristic tendencies of the day both in labor and capitalistic circles, and it is from the regulating power and stability which they give that relief is to come if it comes at all.

Palliatives may be found, and they doubtless will be, which will tend to allay contributory agencies of a purely monetary nature, but these latter are but symptomatic, not causal, and their removal will but *alleviate*, not remove, the root of the evil. Among such protective measures changes in our currency conditions must come first. The Sherman Law, debasing our circulating medium, was a fruitful breeder of distrust, and destroyed millions of dollars of that immense volume of credit upon which the bulk of the business of the country is done. Now that this has been accomplished, the minds of our financiers should be turned to the devising of some species of local currency which will have all the stability of our national bank notes, but which, at the same time, will be more elastic and better suited to the demands of local trade. This will give us a medium which will expand and contract in conformity with the demands of commerce and, at the same time, will not place us under the necessity of subsidizing silver producers at the expense of our industrial life. Further than this, greater solidarity is needed among our banking institutions. The English system which places the ultimate reserve in the Bank of England and depends upon it to manage and allay a panic, while it contains many inherent defects, is undoubtedly of inestimable

service in a time of financial stress. The temporary arrangement by means of which the banks of New York and other large cities came to one another's rescue during the panic of last summer is susceptible of development and will tend to lend some solidarity to the commercial and industrial world in case of another stress.

Palliatives or panaceas for the prevention of industrial depressions are more difficult of formulation. As is well known, the depression through which we are now passing was in its beginning almost purely monetary, but its long duration shows that the country had been preparing for its coming by long years of speculative activity. Despite the present reassuring trade reports it bids fair to make its influence manifest for years to come. The depression of 1873 hung like a pall over the country down to as late as 1879, and it is safe to assert that industrial conditions will not for years to come attain the buoyancy which characterized trade during the years from 1890 to 1892. In fact, it is questionable if conditions will ever be as favorable to labor and capital as they have been during the decade which closed with the latter year. Aside from the fact that speculative railroad building has almost reached its limit, as has the booming of western cities for speculative purposes, capital, both foreign and domestic, has become exceedingly distrustful of American investments on account of the continued outbreaks and excesses of organized labor, which together with the recent exhibitions of Coxeyism has done more to discredit our country abroad than anything which has happened since the repudiation by our states of their indebtedness previous and immediately subsequent to the war. Capital will be slow to enter new fields so long as it is unprotected from the unregulated tyranny of such outbreaks as the last year has witnessed. For these as well as other reasons which might be mentioned, the recovery from the present asphyxiation of industry and trade must be slow and gradual. Undoubtedly the settlement of the tariff discussion will tend to stimulate trade somewhat by enabling producers to accommodate themselves to changed conditions, but until prices become more stable and industry more active, production will

be confined to the satisfaction of immediate demand. Moreover the country has become heavily in debt. The farmer has been delaying the sale of his produce in anticipation of improvement in prices and has hypothecated his anticipated receipts, while the laborer has granted a lien on his wages for months to come to his grocer, clothier, shoemaker, and those who have advanced him the means of existence during the past twelve months.

For these reasons it is believed that convalescence will be slow and gradual, but with confidence restored and the pending conflicts between capital and labor harmonized, the process of healing will be rapid, for no country has shown such marvelous recuperative power in the past as has the United States.

From a study of existing conditions, one is led to the belief that the periodic recurrence of trade depressions is inherent in our industrial organism. Only socialism offers a panacea for their prevention, and this is so chimerical, and even by its friends acknowledged to be so wholly a dream of the future, that it scarcely merits notice. As long as competition is the only regulator of industry and the social harmonies remain dependent upon the misdirected efforts of selfishness, it is safe to predict that so long will the world be subject to the recurrence of these industrial plagues, which fill our land with want and destitution, even in the midst of plenty, which crowd our almshouses and prisons with those who would but cannot work, and send out upon the public highways thousands of organized tramps to prey upon public sentiment and bring discredit upon the fair name of democracy.

FREDERIC CLEMONS HOWE.

THE SENATE AND THE LORDS: A COMPARISON.

BY J. CASTELL HOPKINS.

IT IS not often that the Upper House of a free legislature has a measure to consider of greater importance than that recently dealt with by the Senate of the United States. It is still more seldom that a measure goes up from the Lower House with so distinct a mandate from the people behind it. And yet for six long months the civilized world has looked on, at first with expectation, then with amazement, and at last with alarm, while the interests of a great nation have been used as the shuttlecock of faction and the welfare of millions of individuals sacrificed upon the altar of personal greed, ambition, or dislike. Meantime the people have suffered. Fiscal uncertainty always promotes commercial disaster or enhances any national depression which may already exist, and it is safe to say that while American senators have been talking during the half year which has gone since the Wilson Bill was sent to them, the industrial, financial, and commercial interests of the people have by their inaction been more than seriously affected. Stagnation in business and destitution among the working classes have been to some extent a consequence; distrust of the party whose principles were embodied in the measure and whose honor was bound up in its success was another result; loss of prestige by the Senate and the acquisition of a reputation for trickery and political dishonesty was a most unfortunate outcome.

During this period it was natural that considerable discussion should take place as to the position of a second chamber in the Constitution; as to its duties toward the people and its value in comparison with the Upper Houses of other countries. Inevitably, the British House of Lords was dealt with, but always to its disadvantage, and especially so after some conflict of opinion

between it and the House of Commons, or some burst of denunciation from a Labouchere or John Burns. But in what has been said and written a certain resemblance in duties, in functions, and in development between the two bodies has been overlooked, while an important difference in conduct during two important crises and under certain important conditions seems to have been entirely forgotten.

Alexander Hamilton in the *Federalist* describes the chief objects of those who implanted the Senate in the Constitution. As regards the equal representation of states, the share in appointments to office and control of treaties there can of course be no distinct comparison with the House of Lords. But in acting as a check to the president's power; in restraining the impetuosity of the Lower House; in providing a body of men whose greater experience, longer term of membership, and comparative independence of popular election, would promote stability in the government of the nation, maintain its reputation and character abroad, and conduce to continuity of foreign policy—there can be no doubt that the fathers of the republic copied the British Upper House, and in doing so builded better than they knew. Certainly Hamilton never dreamed that the Senate would one day be able to override the House of Representatives or block the expressed will of the people.

Leaving aside, therefore, the difference between hereditary succession and state election, as not particularly material to the point, we find that a century ago the two Chambers—the one in a monarchical, the other in a republican country—started upon a somewhat similar basis. If the British House did not control treaties and patronage, its members certainly had more than their share of influence in the various ministries in which they led or participated during the greater portion of the time. And if the American Senate boasted the membership of many of the republic's greatest men, its most illustrious orators, statesmen, and diplomatists, so also the British Second Chamber could claim fully as high a rank in the long succession of premiers, ministers, ex-ambassadors, generals, and leaders of every phase of the national life, who found their places within its walls. But in

one all-important respect the two Houses have grown further apart as the years rolled on. While the Senate has acquired greater power and has come to be regarded as the most influential Upper House in the world, the Lords have gradually lost ground in the country and prestige abroad. While the American Chamber has become tyrannical, the British House has developed more and more regard for the expressed will of the people. The one has grown to be the strongest body in the republic, the other has assumed the useful function of averting hasty legislation and ascertaining definitely the direction which the popular desires appear to take.

Yet at a crisis which affects the commercial, financial, and general interests of the country, the House of Lords, as I am about to prove, shows to immensely greater advantage. During the period of disaster which has lately passed away and the time of severe depression which has not yet gone, the patriotism of every American citizen was surely required in the support of the administration and the promotion of strong and stable government. If ever the Duke of Wellington's famous principle, "the Queen's government must be carried on," deserved a new and vigorous application, it was in the case of the tariff reforms which had been supported at the national elections of 1892 by such a sweeping vote. But the only result has been an exhibition of selfishness, wire-pulling, and alleged corruption on the part of the Senate, which has gone far to destroy its great reputation and annihilate the popularity it formerly possessed.

How different the action of the House of Lords during the national crisis brought about by depression, famine, and agitation in 1846! As in the United States at the beginning of this year, the country was in the midst of deep distress, extending to all classes and conditions of men. Bread was dear, labor scarce, agitation abundant, and confidence gone. But the one thing needed was tariff reform—the abolition of the Corn Laws and lifting of the almost innumerable burdens imposed upon the masses. However beneficial protection had once been, it had some years before this reached a point which boded disaster and for the time at least necessitated sweeping amendment or com-

plete abolition. But action along such lines meant injury and perhaps ruin to the agricultural and landed interests. And those interests were synonymous with the welfare of the members of the House of Lords. It might therefore have been expected that the Peers would make a desperate fight for protection; that they would struggle in the last ditch for the interests of their property and products; that they would defy the people rather than sacrifice personal and pecuniary considerations to the public welfare.

The measure which practically abolished the Corn Laws passed the Commons by a majority of 98 and was sent up to a Chamber in which it is probable that not more than five or six members were convinced free-traders. The Peers were fully conscious of what the measure involved. Some believed it meant far more disastrous consequences than any mere injury to agricultural interests. Lord Feversham declared it to be part of "a downward movement calculated to overthrow the constitution," and Lord Gage inquired if there was "one known or suspected enemy to the Church or State, Crown or Aristocracy, who would not be found heart and hand urging on this measure." The Duke of Richmond in moving the rejection of the bill declared it likely to inflict a deadly blow upon British agriculture; to be fraught with ruin to the nation; to be a retrospective law for the confiscation of property; and "a measure which if carried into law will shake the very foundations of the Throne, will cripple the Church, endanger our institutions, and convert our hitherto happy and contented people from a state of comparative comfort to one of misery and wretchedness. I believe it will lead to endless confusion and anarchy."

The Marquis of Londonderry in defending the bill admitted it to be largely "a question of rent-roll and profit," which will seem a curious thing to do in a House filled with great landlords. Lord Carnarvon "believed that nine tenths of those whom he addressed were unfriendly at heart to the withdrawal of the principle of protection." The Earl of Wicklow thought the proposed change was "one by which the landed interest would be ousted from their property," and the Duke of Cleve-

land declared that the occasion would be memorable in history for the sacrifice of private opinion. But the speech of the debate was that of Lord Stanley, afterwards Earl of Derby and prime minister, who with characteristic ability, vigor, and eloquence, attacked the measure and denounced those who spoke of the Peers as a grinding aristocracy or as heartless landlords.

He fully believed, however, that the general result would be the eating up of the greater part of the landlord's rental, serious loss to the tenant farmer, the discharge of many laborers, and the lowering of wages. In the main his prophecies have been fulfilled by time, and the competition following upon free trade has without doubt deeply injured the agricultural interests of England. And Lord Stanley's appeal to the Peers to avert "a pauper and dependent aristocracy" was very skilful and eminently calculated to move his audience. But he looked beyond the body which he addressed to the great mass of landed proprietors whom it really represented and asked support for their interests and welfare.

"I speak," said he, "of men *unennobled* by rank, and many of them *undistinguished* by great wealth, but who, and their ancestors before them for generations after generations, have been the center each of his respective locality; who have the prestige of old associations attached to their names; who conduct the business of their respective counties; who influence the opinions and feelings of their respective neighborhoods; who exercise a modest and decent hospitality, and preside over a tenantry who have hereditary claims upon their consideration and affections."

No more effective ground could have been taken than this. Yet appeals to class prejudice, to Tory fears of change and of the future, were equally useless against the consciousness of the Peers that the people required free food and that it ought to be given them even though their own pockets suffered. Neither appeals to sentiment or selfishness could prevail against the patriotism which made a much misrepresented body think of country first, class second. The bill, therefore, was allowed to

pass, though a formal protest signed by 89 peers shows how deeply injurious its principles were believed to be. This document asserted the injustice of withdrawing protection from the landed interests, leaving them subjected at the same time to exclusive burdens imposed for purposes of general advantage.

A further difference in the manner of treating a commercial and fiscal crisis was the time occupied in legislation. The Wilson Bill was introduced in the House of Representatives almost a year ago, and passed into the Senate on February 1, 1894. Thence its mutilated shadow emerged early in August to run the gauntlet of the Lower House once more. That it has done so reflects infinite credit upon the moderation of the representatives and their desire to settle a much vexed question. On the other hand the Corn Importation Bill was introduced into the House of Commons on March 9, 1846, passed into the Lords on May 15, was discussed and passed by the Upper House on June 25. It received the royal assent in three and a half months after presentation to the Commons. Yet the one measure involved a great and complete national change of policy, the other only touched the fringe of free trade and possible reform.

One more illustration may be given of the greater adaptability and moderation of the Lords as compared with the Senate. The recent Budget Bill which passed the House of Commons by the miserable majority of fourteen, was peculiarly unacceptable to the aristocracy and to the Upper House. It imposed, by means of death duties, many burdens upon the land and English agriculture at a time when they could ill be borne. It will cause many country homes through the length and breadth of England to be closed. It will ultimately throw a large number of domestic servants and agricultural laborers out of employment. It spares personal property at the expense of real property and of land. It lets off the rich radical capitalist who has made his money out of the working classes with a minimum of taxation and imposes the maximum upon the already hard pressed landowner. It is complex in details to the point of bewilderment and utterly unjust in its general application.

Yet because precedent made it impossible to amend the measure without rejecting it entirely, thus putting the whole financial arrangements of the government and country in a state of frightful confusion, the House of Lords passed the bill after one day's discussion. There was no doubt as to its power of rejection, and also little reason to doubt that if the step had been taken the objectionable features would ultimately have been dropped. But the public service and administration have to be carried on, and even peers like the Duke of Devonshire, whose estates will bear an enormous burden as a consequence, preferred to endure that result rather than risk a collision with the Lower House over a measure which affected the immediate financial interests of the whole country.

It is indeed well that this power of interference over money bills has become dormant, even though the Commons may take advantage of the fact, and it would be well for the United States if its Senate were restricted in the right to propose and concur in amendments to bills for raising revenue. The House of Lords undoubtedly has the privilege of such interference, Mr. Gladstone going so far as to admit the fact in 1861, and to add in his official position as Chancellor of the Exchequer that "I think the House of Lords is right and wise in avoiding any formal surrender of the power, even of amendment, in cases where it might think it justifiable to amend a bill relating to finance." But the beauty and chief excellence of the British system is that powers unexercised become not exactly lost, but dormant, and precedent soon merges into practice. Hence it has become customary not to interfere with money bills, even when new and threatening legislation is tacked on. What a cutting of the knot it would be if the American House of Representatives when fresh from the people could legislate in fiscal matters to suit the known and expressed wish of the electorate !

Undoubtedly in this connection British countries are more fortunate than the United States. Toward the close of 1878 the most important general election in its history occurred in Canada. The issue was protection as against a revenue tariff, and the former principle was victorious. Early in the year the

new Parliament met and on March 14 the tariff arrangements were presented to the Commons. The proposals were a veritable fiscal revolution, and affected every interest and industry and individual in the country. Yet by May 15 the measure had become law and Parliament was prorogued. So it was recently with the alterations in the tariff introduced at Ottawa by Mr. Foster, minister of finance. A few weeks sufficed for the discussion of details and ventilation of views and principles. The country was not kept in any lengthy suspense, and almost before it knew that really important changes were contemplated, business was adjusting itself to the changes made. The same result followed in New South Wales two years ago when Sir George Dibbs carried the country upon a protective policy. Parliament received at his hands the tariff, and in the course of a short time its main proposals became the law of the land.

The whole difference turns upon the system of ministerial responsibility in British countries as opposed to the elaborately divided powers of American administration. In the former case the ministers are responsible to Parliament and thence to the people for all legislation. When the government introduces anything so important as a tariff measure, it stands or falls by the result. Every detail has been studied, every interest considered as far as possible. The party as a whole is pledged to its support. The Upper House is not strong enough or else has not the right to amend or reject it, and, unless the government has a very small majority, continuous obstruction or any delay injurious to national interests is almost impossible. Within a very few months after a general election which turns upon the fiscal question, the will of the people is thus in distinct operation upon the national tariff.

No Upper House either in Britain, in Australia, in Canada, or South Africa, will withstand the ascertained wishes of the people. In England it has the power but not the inclination. In the United States it has both. And yet the Senate is not really any more a popular institution than the Lords. Stability in its case is growing into monopoly; inequality of representation into a menace to the will of the people. If hereditary rank

is necessary for membership in the House of Lords, great wealth has become almost a *sine qua non* in the American Senate. Originally an incorporation of the distrust of democracy felt by the founders of the nation, it has now become a drag upon the wheel of popular reform. For a century the trusted representative of much that was honored and great in the national life, it has now developed into the home of what may be termed conservative demagogism.

If the House of Lords rejects measures purely partisan in their origin and largely theoretical in their application, it does not wantonly oppose reforms which the voice of the people definitely demands. If the British House is not elective, it at least represents great interests, great landed property, an influential and widely dispersed class, important local and national duties. But it is the misfortune of the Senate to represent personal ambition, personal wealth, and the personal manipulation of state politics to the advantage of the individual rather than of the country. It is also becoming yearly more and more a battlefield for demagogues who aspire to gain the ear of the people with a view to higher position, and who are always willing to sacrifice honor to expediency, and the national interests to individual desires. And while we never hear of corruption in the Lords and know that its members serve the state from principle and without fee, the world has lately stood aghast at reports of wire-pulling, corrupt lobbying, and indecent speculation among members of the American Senate.

The end is not yet. Tariff arrangements may be made and unmade, national depressions may come and go, but without dogmatism, it is safe to say that two Chambers, such as the House and the Senate have become, can hardly continue session after session having interminable disputes, conferences, and compromises without the people coming to the conclusion that only one popular and powerful House is possible in a great modern state. Such has been the experience of Great Britain, Canada, and the Australias. Such will ultimately be the experience of the United States.

J. CASTELL HOPKINS.

THE FUNCTIONS OF MONEY.

BY E. L. RECTOR.

ONE of the most hopeful signs of our time is the deep and widespread interest awakened in the public mind upon economic questions. Of these there are none that are more important, or more intricate and less understood, than those pertaining to the public finances and the national currency.

When we consider the complicated and abstruse nature of these monetary and financial questions, which have been so precipitately thrust for solution upon the public mind, without preliminary training or preparation for the task, we need not wonder at the many contradictory, impracticable, and visionary theories and suggestions that have been advanced.

It is not the purpose of this article to present any new theories of finance, or to suggest any novel plan of escape from existing financial complications. There has been already too much of the new, the startling, and the sensational, injected into scientific investigation. As a people, we are lacking in that spirit of conservatism and humility so essential to success in scientific studies. We are losing too much of our reverence for the laborious researches and the garnered wisdom of the past. We are becoming too much inflated with the pride of independent, uncultivated thought.

There is, I believe, more hope of a solution of our difficulties in a dispassionate, appreciative review of the generally accepted principles and theories of finance, with a study of their application to existing financial conditions, than there is in the extravagant and revolutionary theories with which it is sought to subvert and replace them.

Money has been called "the tool of commerce." It performs its chief functions in the distribution of wealth. It is never an

article of consumption. It does not minister directly to our physical comfort, convenience, or sustenance. Practically it performs no labor and suffers no wear and subserves no material use. Its normal state, whether represented by coined metal or coined certificates, is one of quiescence. Its chief offices are performed by bills of exchange, or by transfers upon ledgers. Strictly speaking, it is never *borrowed* to be returned to the lender, but is bought, to be repaid in kind at some future date, either with or without interest.

A distinction has been drawn between the *intrinsic* value of money, or its value as a material product, and its commercial or exchangeable value, which is represented by its purchasing power. The government by coining the metal may invest it with the properties and uses of money, and thus by giving it a new and wider utility, may greatly enhance the intrinsic value of the metal. The coin is still nothing more than a commodity. The raw product of the mines is manufactured by the mint into a finished product ready for use. The stamp is only a mark of identification; it simply certifies that this is a dollar, that it contains so many grains of silver or gold; but the worth or value of the dollar is determined, like that of all other products, by the law of supply and demand. Hence the coin has no value beyond that of the metal it contains, with the cost of coinage added, and its intrinsic value is its only real value.

I know that this position is denied by those theorists who contend that money, as such, is simply a symbol or representative of values, that by the fiat of the state it stands for a certain value, without regard to the material on which the fiat is stamped. In other words, that it is equivalent to a certificate of deposit, issued by the directors of the great coöperative association known as the state, and entitling the bearer to draw upon the accumulated wealth of the entire community for a certain amount of values.

The fatal defect of this theory of fiat money is, that it leaves no standard of values. As long as a dollar stands for a specific number of grains of gold or silver—articles of intrinsic value which are approximately uniform in quantity and cost of pro-

duction and hence in relative value—the holder of a dollar is entitled to receive for it, and he can exchange it for, the equivalent in value of the metal represented in the dollar, and this will be equally true whether he deliver the coin or a certificate of deposit of the bullion in the treasury.

This theory of fiat money was strengthened, if not first suggested, by the suspension of specie payments by the Bank of England in the year 1797, when, in order to meet the exigencies of trade, and in order to avoid the disastrous consequences of the financial failure of the greatest commercial empire in the world, and in order to escape universal financial ruin, the business world by common consent agreed to receive and pass its worthless bank notes at par. The fiction served its purpose, and averted impending financial disaster.

The fiat money theorists find another illustration and argument in the legal tender act of the United States, which gave to three hundred and forty-six million dollars' worth of United States notes, commonly called greenbacks, a forced circulation by making them a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, except duties on imports and interest on the public debt.

There are, however, several vital distinctions between our greenbacks and the fiat money of the theorists. The legal tender act, though tainted with the vice of repudiation, and being *ex post facto* in its operation, impairing the obligation of pre-existing contracts, was nevertheless held to be constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States. The doctrine of these decisions when followed to its ultimate consequences would seem to recognize the right of Congress to create money. But as the act under consideration virtually provided for the annual redemption and reissue of the notes, by making them a legal tender in payment of all public dues except duties on imports and interest on the public debt, the objectionable features of the act were practically eliminated.

Another distinction between the greenbacks and fiat money is, that the former do not displace gold and silver as money, nor destroy the metallic standard for the measure of values, but the

value of the dollar as before is determined by the value of the metal it contains or represents. The fiat theory, on the contrary, involves a complete revolution in the financial systems of the world. Under it money will cease to have an intrinsic, though variable, value, by virtue of which alone it now serves, however imperfectly, to measure other values. It will simply become the worthless symbol of an indeterminate quantity. There is no such thing as a dollars' worth of value in the abstract. There is nothing fixed and absolute about values. A dollar that does not contain or represent or stand for a definite quantity of some valuable thing is worthless as a measure of values or as a medium of exchange. Like the illusive mirage of the desert, it represents nothing tangible or real, and is a delusion and a snare.

There neither is nor can be any fixed and absolute standard of values. Values are always relative and variable, fluctuating with time and place and circumstances. The importance of money as a measure of values is much exaggerated; for as the value of an article is often subject to great and rapid changes, without any corresponding change in the article itself, the measure is only true at the particular time and place it is made. In all the great markets of the world daily prices-current are issued, in the ceaseless effort to keep up with the fluctuations in values. It is this characteristic of values, their instability and uncertainty, that renders them the subject of the most extensive, if not the most demoralizing, gambling that is carried on in the world.

Money plays a more important part as a measure of credit. For the equal protection of the debtor and creditor, and in the interest of trade, it is of the greatest importance that one uniform standard of money be adopted, and that the volume of money in circulation bear as nearly as possible a uniform ratio to the volume of business to be transacted. It is evident that these considerations are of far greater moment than the volume of the circulating medium, or the amount per capita in circulation, because, should the volume of the circulating medium be either increased or diminished one half, it would not seriously

affect the facilities of exchange, since as the volume increased the value would diminish, and *vice versa*, but the one change suggested would force the creditor to lose half of what was due him, and the other would force the debtor to pay twice what he owed.

Hence we cannot fail to realize the ruinous consequences of an unstable, arbitrary, fictitious, or inflated currency, when we reflect that the bulk of the world's business is done on credit, and its countless transactions are based upon comparisons and estimates of the present and prospective values of the numberless commodities of which it is made up. Under the most favorable circumstances, and the freest and most unhampered conditions of trade, there are enough elements of uncertainty to call into play all the shrewdness, penetration, and foresight of which the human mind is capable. But when the government arbitrarily undertakes to regulate the supply of money all basis for intelligent calculation is taken away, the best laid plans are confused, and business enterprise is paralyzed.

From what has been said we may draw the following conclusions :

1. Money is a commodity or article of value, and forms part of the productive capital of a country.
2. Like all other commodities, its value is determined by the great law of demand and supply.
3. The doctrines of free trade are as applicable to money as to any other article of commerce.
4. Any interference of the government with the free exchange of money for other commodities, foreign or domestic, is an unwarrantable violation of the freedom of trade.
5. Any limitation upon the coinage of gold or silver by legislation is an arbitrary and unwarranted interference with the harmless use and enjoyment of property, and is contrary to the genius of our free American institutions, and in violation of the principles of free trade.
6. The government having a monopoly of the coinage, any exorbitant charge therefor is in the nature of an unjust and oppressive tax.

7. Any effort on the part of the government to arbitrarily fix the relative value of gold and silver by a coinage stamp is in violation of the fundamental principles of free trade and of the equality of property rights before the law, leads to unjust discrimination, confuses and demoralizes the productive industries of a country, and besides is utterly futile and abortive for accomplishing the purpose intended.

Assuming that the principles of free trade are in accord with a democratic form of government and the genius of our free institutions, the question arises, How shall a circulating medium of exchange be provided? How shall the government provide its citizens with this indispensable tool of commerce, and yet leave them free to use it as they please? Having promised not to advance any new theory, I shall present in answer to this question a quotation from M. Say, a distinguished French writer upon political economy, whose treatise upon this subject first appeared about the beginning of the present century, translations of which have been adopted as a text-book in most of the universities of Europe in which this science is taught, as well as in some of the most prominent institutions of learning in the United States. This learned author says :

"The precious metals are so well adapted for the purposes of money as to have gained a preference almost universal; and as no other material has so many recommendations, no change in this particular is desirable.

"So also of their division into equal and portable particles. They may very properly be coined into pieces of equal weight and quality, as has heretofore been the practice among most civilized nations.

"Nor can there be any better contrivance than the giving them such an impression as shall certify the weight and quality; or than the exclusive reservation to government of the right of impressing such certificate, and, consequently, of coining money; for the certificate of a number of coiners, all working together and in competition one with the other, could never give an equal security.

"Thus far, then, and no farther, should the public authority

intermeddle with the business of money. The value of a piece of silver is arbitrary, and is established by a kind of mutual accord on every act of dealing between one individual and another, or between the government and an individual. Why therefore attempt to fix its value beforehand? since after all the fixation must be imaginary and can never answer any practical purpose in the money transactions of mankind. Why give a denomination to this fixed imaginary value which money can never possess? For what is a dollar, a ducat, a florin, a pound sterling, or a franc—what but a certain weight of gold or silver of a certain established standard of quality? And if this be all, why give these respective portions of bullion any other name than the natural one of their weight and quality? Five grammes of silver, says the law, shall be equivalent to a franc; which is just as much as to say five grammes of silver is equivalent to five grammes of silver. For the only idea presented to the mind by the word franc, is that of the five grammes of silver it contains. . . . Why not call it simply five grammes of silver?

“This slight alteration, verbal, critical, and nugatory as it may seem, is of immense practical consequence. Were it once admitted, it would be no longer possible to stipulate in nominal value; every bargain would be a barter of one substantial commodity for another—of a given quantity of silver for a given quantity of grain, or butcher’s meat, or cloth, etc., etc.

“Wherever a contract for a long prospective period was entered into, its violation could not escape detection; a person taking an obligation to pay a given quantity of fine silver, at a certain day, would know precisely how much silver he would have to receive at the period assigned, provided his debtor continued solvent.

“The whole monetary system would thenceforth fall to the ground. A system replete with fraud, injustice, and robbery, and moreover so complicated as rarely to be thoroughly understood even by those who make it their profession. It would ever after be impossible to effect an adulteration of the coin, except by issuing counterfeit money; or to compound with creditors,

without an open, avowed bankruptcy. The coinage of money would become a matter of perfect simplicity, a mere branch of metallurgy."

And again he says: "The power of a government to facilitate the transactions of exchange and contract, wherein the commodity money is employed, consists in dividing the metal into different pieces of one or more grammes or centigrammes, in such a manner as to admit of instant calculation of the number of grammes a given payment will require."

The magnitude and importance of the question propounded, and the simplicity, perspicuity, completeness, and adequacy of the answer, I think, are a sufficient apology for this long quotation. When we reflect that these words were penned nearly a century ago, and that they have been accepted, indorsed, and promulgated by the leading expounders of political economy throughout the world, we may well wonder that they have been so utterly ignored and disregarded in the practical regulation of national finances.

By the adoption of the plan suggested all the practical benefits of bimetallism would be obtained, and each metal be allowed full, indiscriminating, and unlimited competition, as a medium of exchange, without any legislative interference whatever; the government simply coining for all comers, and guaranteeing the genuineness of the coin by its certificate of weight and quality stamped upon it; and by receiving it for public dues and paying it out in public disbursements, just as its citizens receive and pay it out.

Under this plan there would be nothing arbitrary in the creation and circulation of the currency of the country. Its adoption would tend to greater simplicity and economy in the management of public affairs, and to a higher standard of integrity and purity in the public service. It would also tend to divorce the government from participation in the great industrial enterprises, over which it is appointed as umpire and protector. By its adoption there would be removed from the public administration the opportunity, and with it the temptation, to engage in wholesale schemes of repudiation and robbery under the

guise of financiering and under the forms of law. By its adoption there would be substituted for the prevailing illogical and abortive theory of bimetallism, a bimetallism absolutely impartial, non-political, and practical.

The coins being honest money, and having a reliable certificate of weight and quality stamped upon them, would be worth more than bullion in foreign markets, and yet the difference would not be sufficient to encourage the importation of foreign bullion for coinage. In any event there could be no danger of a surfeit of money, because in this, as in all other branches of commerce, it is the damming up of the channels of trade which causes an overflow of surplus products, and gives rise to the cry of overproduction. There being no restriction upon coinage or circulation, the system would be automatic, and the supply would adjust itself to the demand.

One of the most important branches of my subject remains undisposed of, and that is the national bank notes. This branch alone would furnish material for a lengthy article, and as this paper has already reached sufficient length I shall have to defer its consideration to another time.

E. L. RECTOR.

A FALLACY OF THE W. C. T. U.

BY MRS. ELLA W. WINSTON.

THE W. C. T. U., with its great army of members, with its missionaries organizing unions in all parts of the world, has good reason to feel discouraged, if its object be, as is claimed, the suppression of intemperance. As high an authority as Frances E. Willard admits "There never was so much liquor manufactured in any one year since time began as in the year 1893, and as a consequence never did so much liquor flow down the people's throats as in this same year of grace." In many places where prohibition has been introduced it has been abandoned. In states where a popular vote has been given for constitutional prohibition they have failed to enact the law. There is at present before the legislature of Iowa a substitute for their prohibitory law. A recent writer in the *New York Independent*, on the "State of the Temperance Cause," says, "It is as clear as demonstration can make it, that neither statutory restriction nor any form of prohibition does or can insure total abstinence." A prominent physician of New York City admits that "all competent authorities agree that drunkenness is increasing." And this in spite of the great effort that the women of the world are making to eradicate it!

Why has the W. C. T. U. accomplished so little for the cause of temperance? It has been in operation long enough to have done something toward the suppression of intemperance if it has within it the power for such work. In its ranks are women of ability and culture. They use the name of Christ as evidence of their belief. But while these educated and Christian women are giving their time and lives to the work of improving their race, children are being born into misery and wretchedness, who are constantly supplying work for these benevolent individuals.

These women, banded together, as they claim, for the relief of the world's unfortunates, have not realized results commensurate with their efforts. They have proved themselves unable to lay healing hands on the world's woe and heartache.

Is the W. C. T. U. discouraged? Not at all. Miss Willard, after admitting the increase of intemperance, comforts herself by assigning the following reasons as the cause therefor: There was a presidential campaign last year, which "always lowers the moral atmosphere for a year before it begins, and a year after it is over." This year there was a financial panic, and a World's Fair in Chicago. It needs a wise logician to understand just how these causes work to increase intemperance; but Miss Willard should know, if any one does. So the W. C. T. U., regardless of its record of failure, will strive on with unwearied zeal to conquer the world for temperance. It has unshaken faith in what it believes to be its greatest need. Its leaders have many times informed the people of their lacking weapon, and the majority of the members agree with the leaders. They want the ballot. Give woman the ballot, and the world's redemption from drunkenness is assured. The women of Colorado are, as they say, fitted out with "the weapon of power," and one state is to be purified throughout the length and breadth of its borders. For some unexplained reason this purifying process has not occurred in Wyoming, where women have enjoyed the use of the "weapon of power" for some time. Nevertheless it is confidently asserted that Colorado is to be cleansed. And one enthusiastic woman has allowed herself and her sisters five years in which to do the work.

Will woman's ballot accomplish what its advocates claim? Or will it fail in the suppression of intemperance as other means have? The subject is worthy of investigation. If all women were wise, intelligent, and pure themselves, woman's ballot might have a beneficent influence. It is doubtful, however, if the strongest advocate of equal suffrage dare affirm that a majority of women possess these qualifications. It has not been satisfactorily shown that a majority of women wish the ballot. Neither has it been shown that in case they did wish it, a majority of

them would vote for prohibition. In Colorado, where woman's ballot is expected to do so much for temperance at the present time, the Germans are organizing to offset the vote of the W. C. T. U. by German women, who will vote according to the wishes of their male relatives.

The skeptical mind can not refrain from inquiring about those 8,373 women arrested in the streets of London, in one year, for being drunk and disorderly, that Miss Willard told of in her opening address before the National W. C. T. U. Convention, held in Denver, 1892, and asking what sort of temperance voters they would make. Is London the only city that has such an array of drunken and disorderly women on its streets? Or have other cities and towns throughout the world numbers proportional to their size? If so, it looks as if there might be a good many women who would not vote for temperance measures, and the world's redemption from drunkenness might be indefinitely postponed, even with the ballot granted to woman.

All who had the pleasure of listening to Miss Willard have probably heard her speak of her mother, and know that she habitually ascribes whatever is worthy in her own life to the influence her mother exerted over her. It is not surprising that one so fortunate should view all mothers through the radiance which her own cast around her. And yet it is strange that the thought never occurs to Miss Willard that if the average man and woman had possessed a mother like hers, there would be no need of Frances Willard spending her life trying to save the fallen. Strange she never seems to see that the world has greater need of wise mothers than it has of any sort of voters. It is quite unlikely that children born of women of which her mother was a type would ever be in need of special reform efforts from outsiders. Talk as much as she may of protection for the homes of the nation, her home needed no such protection. There was no likelihood that she or her brother would ever go to a saloon from their home. They were firmly anchored. The noble mother held them to the right.

Handwritten note:
This is a very common fallacy
of which we are all guilty

It is not unusual to hear W. C. T. U. speakers say, "The men make the laws and they license the saloons, and the women

have no chance to stem the evil tide, work as they may." And here is another strange thing. All these sinful legislators were at one time wholly under woman's influence. There was a time when woman might have made them what she would. But we are also told they went into the world and the evil influences ruined them. Why were not such men kept, as Frances Willard has been, by the power of their mother's influence? Because their mothers were not like hers. If they had been, in all probability these men would have been as noble as Miss Willard. Well, perhaps their mothers were not properly trained. Very likely. But their mothers were born of women, and might have been trained to be whatever the mother wished.

Woman can not shirk her responsibility in this matter, or ignore it. Lay the blame on the tyrant man; do what she may, there is at bottom nature's inexorable law, which will not be repealed. So long as women bear the children of the world, so long must they be held responsible for the sort of people in the world. It is useless to say the fathers corrupt the children, thereby nullifying the good influences of the mothers. All these fathers had mothers, who might and should have trained their sons to nobler work in life than that of corrupting their own offspring, either by the force of heredity or any other force. Any mother has the power to give her child before its birth a character no father can contaminate. This is woman's power and woman's burden, and the wonder is that any woman, knowing this, can ever demand more power for her sex.

Knowing, too, the use that so many women make of their inherent rights, in these days of constantly widening avenues for woman's work, it is quite old-fashioned to remark, "that the hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that moves the world." Still it is true, and being so, it bears reiteration. And until the hands rocking cradles realize their power, and learn that the word temperance means making the immortal souls intrusted to their care fit temples for the indwelling of God's Holy Spirit, there will not be radical temperance reformation in this country, nor any other, let the women meet in multiplex organizations from now until the end of time.

One mother training her children for purity and usefulness is a greater factor for good than any organization however powerful. "Her children rise up and call her blessed." They go out to form homes like the one their mother made for them, and thus, in ever widening circles, the good influence extends. Victor Hugo spoke truly when he said: "All the nuns in the world are not worth as much as one mother in the formation of a young girl's soul. . . . All the crimes of the man begin in the vagabondage of the child. . . . The two prime functions of the state are the nurse and the schoolmaster."

One scans in vain the long list of works and reforms in which women are now engaged for some society or club which has for its object the training of girls for motherhood. The impressing upon their minds during the formation period of their character the power they may exert over children yet unborn. Among the multitude of women eager for reform, anxious to alleviate human misery, not one seems to realize the importance of such work. It is not discussed in their congresses or associations. It is not mentioned in their spoken or printed addresses. Girls are taught to be everything but mothers. And when they become mothers, in the majority of cases they are totally ignorant of their responsibility to their offspring, both before and after birth.

Suppose that the work done by the W. C. T. U. since its organization, instead of vain endeavors to secure legislation prohibiting intemperance, had spent at least a portion of its energies on those who have become mothers in the meantime; suppose they had even once told those mothers that they possessed the power to so train their children that there would never be need of temperance legislation for them. If, instead of teaching young girls that the ballot was their all-important need, they had aroused in them a sense of the seriousness of the maternal relation, might not the record of the past have been one of advancement?

It is but folly to expend energies where by natural law no change can occur. If you plant an acorn you will raise an oak, and no amount of effort can ever make an elm or a maple of it,

or aught save an oak. For of old it was written, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." If the seeds of intemperance are being sown, it is but reasonable to expect a harvest of intemperance. Let those who are earnestly striving to reform the race reflect on the homes of which they have knowledge, and decide whether the majority of boys are being so reared that when they are subjected to the world's influence, they will naturally gravitate toward the saloons, or whether, as far as they are personally concerned, it makes no difference if there are saloons or not, they would never enter them.

The women who are striving to reform the world have been so intent on the "pound of cure" that they have altogether overlooked the "ounce of prevention." They are making herculean efforts to cleanse a stream which is constantly receiving impure supplies. They seem to consider it not worth their while to bestow any attention on the headwaters of this same stream. It cannot be denied that the saloon has many patrons from W. C. T. U. homes, the mothers in such homes having been so engrossed with the general welfare of the nation that they had no time for individual work with their own sons.)

But why, it may be asked, is it so important that girls should be early taught the responsibilities of motherhood? Because it constantly happens that the girls of one generation are the mothers of the next, and any radical change in the national life will come through these girls; through the homes that they will make and through their children. The majority of girls become wives, and the majority of wives become mothers. Let the women who do not marry, either from lack of inclination or whatever reason, follow their tastes. Let the fields where they would work be open to them. For work well done let them be well paid. But such women, noble and gifted as many of them are, philanthropic and uplifting as is much of their work, can never have but a minimum of influence upon their race. And for good reasons. They begin their work with those whose characters are partially, if not altogether, formed. So their influence must always be secondary. But when a woman marries, as the majority of women do and will, when she invokes

maternity, as she does by entering the marriage relation, she need never ask for more power, or for a larger field of usefulness. For she who has the fashioning of a human soul, she who realizes the strength and mystery of prenatal influences, has such an overwhelming responsibility resting upon her, that instead of asking for more she may well exclaim that she already has too much, and shrink from the burden of nature. Woman is the power in the home. She has an influence over her children that their fathers can never have. It was so intended by the Creator, and it must so remain.

In this age of reforms let us have a reform among the girls who marry. Let but a generation of them be so trained that they shall ask on the eve of maternity as did Manoah of old, "How shall we order the child, and how shall we do unto him?" And let Hannah's words be the answer, "As long as he liveth he shall be lent unto the Lord." If this could be, we should have in the next generation a lessening of intemperance and crime which would wonderfully surpass the results of well-meant but mistaken ideas of reform and legislation.

If children are being born with vicious tendencies and such traits are not subdued by proper training after birth, we are as sure to have national intemperance and crime as we are to raise wheat from the seed of wheat, or corn from corn. Legislation may put a check on crime, but it cannot purify human life.

When Timothy Dwight of Yale College was asked how he was educated, he replied, "My answer to the question ends where it began. I had the right mother." From what sort of homes come the children who drink and steal and lie? Who fill the jails and houses of crime? Had they, like Timothy Dwight, "the right mother"? Can such men and women say with Frances Willard, when she dedicates the self-told story of her beautiful life to her mother :

" There is one
Face, that duly as the sun
Rose up for me since life begun.
One royal heart, that never failed me yet " ?

There is no lack of sin and misery in the world, but the

remedy does not lie in the ballot-box. Where does it lie? In individual effort. The good in this world has been wrought that way, and, alas, the wrong also. When the number of individuals who work for righteousness exceed those who do not, then, and not till then, will righteousness abound. The problem of how to reform and advance the race will be solved through the home or it will remain unsolved. Suppose that woman is granted the ballot, does that increase her power with her children? Can she not, if she will, do as much for them without it as she can with it? The women who have homes and children do not need more power. Of those without homes it may be a pleasant fiction to imagine that they are all pure and wise, and that an increase of their power would necessarily imply an increase of beneficent influences. But the stubborn fact remains that among this class of women are to be found many dangerously wicked examples. If women wish to redeem the world they can do so without the ballot. For a woman who would be a power for good with a ballot may be one without it. When a majority of women consecrate their lives to the highest good in life the world will not have long to wait for an era of purity and peace.

The W. C. T. U. demands the ballot as its greatest need. But it is wrong. It has neglected the near for the remote. It clamors for universal protection of homes, when it should teach that each home has power to protect itself. Men and boys are not forced to go to saloons. In nine cases out of ten, those who go there do so from choice. They find there a congenial element, and gratification for natural tastes. They might have been trained differently, but they were not. So long as people want saloons, so long will there be saloons for them. There must be a public sentiment for temperance before prohibitory laws can be enforced. In a republican form of government the laws will be for the majority.

(Mrs.) ELLA WINSTON.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION.

BY D. M. FREDERIKSEN.

IN SENTENCING two strikers to forty days' imprisonment Judge Grosscup said: "I don't think that any man is more in sympathy with the laboring man than I am. I was born among them and I know something of their hardships and feelings. But I cannot understand how these people after being a long time in one employment fall into the misconception that their job belongs to them. But, with that misconception, I can see how they believe what is called the eleventh commandment, 'Take not your brother's job.' Yet, after all, that is not the law of the land."

This indicates exactly the point at issue. The strikers in Chicago this summer, and with them most of the laboring people of the western cities, thought they had certain moral rights, not enforceable by law, but which had for a number of years been successfully enforced by the unions, but as this was not the law of the land they were hopelessly defeated. Each one thought he had certain rights to his position, his job, which the employers were bound to respect. This has gone so far that in the iron industry in Ohio, for instance, there are cases where the employee virtually does own his job, where the employer has no voice whatever in the employment of the assistant of certain employees; so that the man who does the work over night is accountable only to the one who does it during the day, "because it his job," and the wages in the iron industry have risen simultaneously with the strengthening of the Amalgamated Association, so that according to the census figures of 1890 the average increase in the wages in the iron industry, in the states west and north of Ohio inclusive, from 1880 to 1890 has been 43 per cent.

When labor questions are so earnestly fought out on both sides it would be narrow-minded to consider these difficulties as riots and lawlessness merely. When one union will vote to give away thousands of dollars to another, when thousands of men go out on a sympathetic strike, and are ready to resort to violence and to lay themselves open to criminal prosecution, merely to help others to obtain their supposed rights, it shows that the conscience of the laboring part of the community has reached such a point that the questions at issue should be regarded not as a mere private difference between employer and employee, but as a matter of right and wrong to be regulated by the public.

"Compulsory arbitration," says Mr. Springer of Illinois in a recent interview, "has been suggested, but that seems impossible without an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and even in that event it would be inconsistent with our theory of government to compel persons to work at a less rate of wages than they are willing to receive, or to compel employers to pay more wages than they are able to give. In my opinion no new penal law will be enacted, nor is it proper for Congress to create rights or obligations which do not now exist. The only arbitration possible is where each party is willing to submit a disputed question for the decision of outsiders, etc."

But voluntary arbitration does not furnish a remedy unless both sides consent to resort to it, which experience shows is rarely the case, and so a large number of people are now of the opinion that, in spite of what Mr. Springer says, the best solution will probably be that these employment questions shall be settled in court, exactly as property questions are settled now, so that a lawsuit may take the place of the strike as a means of settling labor differences. This proposition deserves to be considered seriously, and I have written this paper in order to see how far such legislation is practicable and within the scope of sound political economy.

All laws of property have been gradually, and some quite recently, developed. "The soil," said the Omahas, "is like the water, like the fire, which cannot be sold." And in the comparative history of institutions, the slow rise of a custom until it

grows and crystallizes into an institution or a law is one of the most interesting things to observe. It takes place either quietly or after a struggle in which each side is fighting for what it considers its rights. It is only after and often through lawlessness that laws have been established. From promiscuousness and abductions have been evolved the family, with laws of marriage and inheritance; from the Witenagemot has sprung the English Parliament; and the greatest of all constitutional documents, the American Constitution, is the historical outcome of the Boston Tea Party, an act entirely lawless in itself.

The laws affecting the descent of landed property have been gradually evolved. Upon the death of the vassal the lord could at first grant the fief to whomsoever he chose, but almost imperceptibly his rights were limited and prescribed, so that he could only levy reasonable fines, which at last ceased, leaving landed property descending from father to son, almost as if the feudal lord had never existed.

We do not even have to go back to the dark ages on the Continent or to the feudal times, to find instances of how laws and institutions originate and how even our apparently most vested rights have sometimes been altered as new conditions arose necessitating it. The "Winners of the West," the squatters, who went out on land they knew not whose, ready to defend their occupancy with their shotguns, had at times a stronger and better recognized "de facto" title to this land than he who had bought it from the government. At Milwaukee, back in the forties, the squatters formed an association to protect their titles, and the purchaser of a squatter's title was better situated than if he had had a legal one. The Homestead Law finally gave legal recognition to the rights of squatters on public land. Similarly, according to the unwritten ethics of the West, the land grant railroads have been compelled to deal very gingerly with the squatters on their land, giving them invariably not only the first right to buy it, but almost their own time in which to pay for it. So also the United States mining laws—the location of claims, etc.—were established by custom and were in force in California before their enactment as laws.

If you go into the woods of Maine to-day you may hear your guide tell you that he has the sole right to kill the beaver at a certain dam. Does he own the land? No, but he has killed the beaver there the last two years, a man who is now dead having killed it every year for over fifteen years back. By the unwritten law of custom that guide has a proprietary interest in that beaver, in which it would not be safe to disturb him.

Thus our institutions have arisen, and thus customs are also being formed to-day which will later be enacted into laws or perpetuated by legal decisions. Our economic conditions continue to increase in complexity. Dealers in lamps take the lamp business away from the dealers in crockery, and dealers in electrical lamps or in railroad lamps specialize the business still further. It must be admitted that our great manufacturing industries and transportation organizations present conditions to-day that were entirely unknown fifty years ago, and that all these changes as they go on call for new laws to correspond with the altered conditions.

The smaller industries and factories evidently cannot be dealt with under a compulsory arbitration law. Here matters must take their course under our present laws, but in the large industries, the railroads, etc., existing conditions of employment have in many cases through the influence of the unions assumed a sufficiently definite form to make legal regulation possible.

Many are now in favor of a codification of these customs, in favor of laws to protect the men against being arbitrarily discharged without damages and without a hearing, laws under which the courts can settle when the employer can reduce the wages of his men and when he must raise them, laws which in such instances as the case mentioned in the iron industry in Ohio would protect the employee in the ownership of his job, in which he is already well confirmed to all practical purposes, and to retain which he and his friends might be ready to resort to violence.

A special act recently passed by the Norwegian Storting ordering a certain manufacturer to pay damages of 10,000 kroner

to 100 employees discharged by him for voting the wrong way, illustrates this view of the matter.

The employers having the ablest counsel would probably suffer no injustice in the trial of such cases, and the legal expense involved to both employers and employees would undoubtedly be light in comparison with what is entailed by the present methods of strikes and lawlessness. In fact, without any doubt the main effect of these as other laws, civil as well as criminal, would be in the deterrent influence that they would have.

The laws forbidding unjust discrimination by railroads were opposed as interfering with the right of the railroads to manage their own business, but are now recognized to be beneficial, and have been enforced with fair success.

So, also, there is no reason why laws prohibiting unjust discrimination by a company among its employees could not be enforced. And when there are existing customs which in most cases are not broken, and which cannot be broken without resulting in violence, the law ought to recognize these customs. Such, for instance, as that no one shall be discharged for belonging to a union or for acting on a grievance committee of his union. And when an employee practically owns a job, or at least has some interest in it which is admittedly recognized in actual business life, this condition might as well be legally recognized.

That the unions often make grotesque mistakes, striking when the state of trade offers no justification for it whatever, or by demanding terms which no prudent employer could possibly consent to, must be granted, and for this reason also the decision of these questions by the judiciary might be a step in advance. It might be best to have legislation under which the unions as such were not recognized at all. But at all events it is desirable that existing customs be ascertained, codified, and enacted into laws as far as possible, because in many cases this might save the community from strikes that are ruinous to our complicated modern business interests.

It is surely important to realize whither we are drifting and

to take measures accordingly. The demand for compulsory arbitration is really for legislation in the direction of recognizing the laborer's interest in, and we might almost say ownership of, his job. The constant arguments in favor of the "protection" of the laborer have of course helped this notion to spread. And as there would be no legal difficulties preventing the courts from awarding proper damages to an employee unjustly discharged,* I shall proceed to consider the economic aspect of this proposed revolution of our present industrial system—for this it certainly is, even if it has already imperceptibly taken effect in many lines of industry.

If we come to the post-office we see a set of employees well-paid, satisfied, a successful institution. They are paid more than the average clerk or messenger, and it is evident that some one, the general public, pays the difference. So, also, it must be understood that such an increase by law of the wages of men as the above proposition of compulsory arbitration involves, *must be paid for by somebody*, viz., by the general public, the consumers, in the form of increased prices for the articles produced by these favored employees.

But if the public, the voters, decide to suffer this increase in order to better the condition of these workingmen, why object to it? May it not be better for the community to pay slightly higher prices with this end in view? Is it not probably better for the community that the railroad engineers, for instance, should, chiefly through the influence of their unions and through existing customs established by those unions, receive from \$80 to \$150 a month, as now, than that they should receive only the wages of common mechanics or laborers?

An employer evidently cannot be compelled to pay a certain scale of wages if he prefers to shut down, but the law can say to him, "Unless you will pay fair wages you must shut down or stop business, or go into some other business to which this act does not apply." And thus through increasing the price of the products, the condition of laborers can be regulated in large industries where such laws can be enforced. It will be a case

* See an article by Judge L. Dexter, *Journal of Social Science*, October, 1891.

analogous to the internal revenue on whisky, which is paid by the consumer, not, however, for the benefit of the employees of the distiller, but to the government.

There is no bad political economy in the whisky tax, neither would there be in such labor legislation, such compulsory arbitration, as is now demanded by thousands of workingmen. The only question is, Can such legislation be enforced, how far-reaching should it be, and do the voters want it?

The interstate commerce law was for a number of years enforced with fair success. And when we look at the matters it is proposed to settle by compulsory arbitration, questions of unjust discharge without cause, questions of danger to life and limb of the employees, and questions of the amount of wages to be paid, there is no doubt that they can be likewise dealt with. If the courts can determine whether railroad rates are reasonable or not, they can also judge as to the reasonableness of a proposed scale of wages. The questions now referred to masters in chancery in equity proceedings are often more complicated than these would be.

In fact, as the business life of the nation is developing, as trusts and combinations increase and gain strength, it is a matter of necessity that the courts should have increased power to deal with what are apparently private vested rights.

Trusts are both necessary and useful, they save needless expense, they regulate the output, prevent extreme fluctuations in prices, and, what is more, they cannot be prevented. They can be regulated, however, and must be regulated, because an unregulated trust is as powerful to tax the community as the government itself. The increased price exacted—or the decrease in price which is prevented—constitutes a tax exactly like the customs tariff. The trusts can be safely left alone, but their profits must be regulated together with the price of their products.

How to do this is the great question of the future, and can there be any doubt but that the best aid and assistance for the community for this purpose will come from the employees of the great corporations themselves? The testimony of these men before the masters in chancery of the compulsory arbitra-

tion courts of the future, given for the purpose of showing their own wages to be unreasonably low, will enable us to regulate the profits of the trusts and will furnish evidence which might not otherwise be easily obtained.

I have now tried to see how far compulsory arbitration is practicable and what would be its economic effect. The question remains, Will the voters desire such class legislation in favor of the laborers in the large industries in the cities, when the effect of it would be felt more or less by all other members of society?

After all, the whole matter must be treated as a practical question rather than as an ethical one. When the feudal vassal gradually obtained the ownership of his feudal lord's domain, it was not because he had any better right to it than the lord. It was simply because this was the way in which the matter shaped itself, and the way which was seen to be the best for the community.

We regulate child labor, sweat-shops, forbid men and women to work under excessively unsanitary conditions, and the step now quite generally demanded is only one degree removed from such legislation.

The fact that there are other laborers who may be ready to accept the wages which shall by the court of arbitration (by the common consent of the community, under the proposed plan) be decided to be too low, need not deter from this legislation, any more than the fact that there are women who are willing to work fourteen hours a day for thirty-five cents or less a day, should deter from prohibiting sweat-shops. In fact, the laborer's job would then be analogous to the vacant lot on which hundreds of men other than the owner would to-day be ready to build were they permitted to do so.

If the standard of living of the laborers in the favored lines of employment could be raised without lowering that of those in agricultural and other pursuits, on whom the loss would chiefly fall, a real gain might be accomplished and the conditions of a large portion of the working classes might be bettered.

There is now a strong sense among the laboring classes that it is a moral wrong to take a striker's place, a feeling that he has almost a vested right in his job. The strength of such existing customs in different lines should be the guide in whatever such legislation may be attempted, and it may be added that to give the laborers a vested interest in their jobs such as they demand is a step in the direction of profit sharing, an idea favored by all economists.

There are at present many things pointing toward the laborer's ownership of his job as the condition of the future in certain lines of industry, and in that case it would be better for us to jump in than to be pushed in. If this shall prove to be an institution now in the process of development—and the quickness with which new unions are formed after every total and crushing defeat of the old ones is an indication in that direction—then the sooner legal recognition is given to existing conditions in this respect, the better it will be for all concerned.

There are, of course, many considerations on which the question of state interference and state socialism hinges which cannot be treated here. All that I have tried to make clear is that the doctrine of compulsory arbitration, as advocated by the workingmen, will bear careful criticism much better than is commonly supposed, and that by the payment of damages under the legislation proposed, compulsory arbitration need in no way interfere with any employer's management of his own business. Nor need any workingmen be compelled to work for less than they wish. After a reduction in wages has been allowed by a compulsory arbitration court, any vacancies that remain may be filled by the unemployed. Such compulsory arbitration would simply be a step in the direction of genuine protection of certain laborers, which would not of necessity upset or greatly alter our present business methods.

D. M. FREDERIKSEN.

HISTORIAN VON HOLST'S "AWAKENING": ARE LABOR'S CLAIMS ANTI-SOCIAL?

BY VICTOR YARROS.

CAPACITY to deal philosophically and impartially with historical material by no means argues capacity for similar treatment of contemporary issues. That it is easier to be just and fair to the past than it is to estimate correctly present movements, is a truism. It would therefore seem to be the duty of historians, who must surely recognize and *realize* the importance of weighing and balancing things which we witness and in which we are concerned, to refrain from hasty verdicts and judgments, to guard against the influence of passion and prejudice, and to subject impressions to the strictest tests. Prof. von Holst's review of the late railroad strike and boycott (known in certain reactionary papers as the "Debs insurrection") in the *Journal of Political Economy*, published by the Chicago University, exemplifies the fatal results of a reckless disregard of this duty. What reader would not naturally expect from Prof. von Holst a calm, clear, dispassionate, and severely argumentative discussion of the great issues that were involved in the great strike? Yet, as a matter of fact, he writes an hysterical, rhetorical, rabid, intemperate philippic which is as superficial in substance as it is objectionable in style. To be perfectly plain about it, Prof. von Holst's essay is almost riotous in its contempt of logic, principle, and common sense. This is a serious accusation, but I expect to prove it, even to those who totally disagree with my own views of the strike. I shall show that Prof. von Holst's conclusions do not at all follow from his premises, which are entirely sound, and that he has been guilty of an amount of question-begging that would be astonishing even in an ignorant writer of a partisan newspaper's editorials.

From a practical point of view, more serious and important than his logical fallacies and loose thinking is Prof. von Holst's outrageously unjust assault upon Governor Altgeld and other officials for alleged protection to rioters and encouragement of crime. Every fair-minded man knows that the governors who protested against federal interference did so from the purest and highest of motives; they sincerely believed, moreover, that they had force enough to maintain order and protect legitimate interests. To charge them with deliberately "blocking the way of the legal avengers of the law" is silly as well as immoral. It is inexcusable even in biased and irresponsible newspapers; on the part of a scholar, historian, and instructor it is absolutely disgraceful.

Prof. von Holst's treatment of the state authorities exemplifies his method of judging men and tendencies, and I have therefore referred to it. But I propose to confine myself strictly to an examination of his case against organized labor. He starts out by assuring us that "at present nothing less than the preservation of society is at issue," and that the "task" organized labor is working at is "the extinction of the vital principle of society." Getting more and more extravagant, he proceeds to declare that labor has unfurled "the banner of anarchy, and the worst kind of anarchy—socialistic anarchy under the guise of 'a government of law, and under the protection of law.'" These assertions the professor undertakes to demonstrate, and he finds all the facts he regards as necessary to his conclusions in the acts, declarations, and avowed intentions of the American Railway Union and other labor bodies.

In order to establish beyond question that organized labor is waging war upon the vital principle of society and civilization, Prof. von Holst, properly enough, gives us his definition of society as he conceives it. The highest type of commonwealth, he says, "is a government of law, in the sense (1) that no authority is possessed by the rulers except as organs of the law; (2) that all the members of the commonwealth are equally and absolutely subject to the law."

To many such a government of law by no means represents

the highest type of commonwealth. Everything depends on what "the law," of which the rulers are the organs, is—how closely it corresponds to the "ethical law," which science formulates. There is an equality of slavery as well as an equality of liberty. Will not the professor accept this substitute to his formula: "The highest type of commonwealth is a society in which every man has the highest liberty compatible with equality of liberty, in which each is free to do as he wills so long as he does not interfere with the equal right of his fellows"? The highest society is one where justice is observed, where nothing is interdicted and punished except actual invasion or aggression. But whether or not the professor accepts this substitute is immaterial. His own premises will convict him of illogic and injustice.

Let us consider the counts of Prof. von Holst's indictment in the order in which they appear. Bear in mind that the accusation is that labor makes war upon the corner-stone of society, upon the root of civilized life. The professor says, referring to the sympathetic strike and boycott ordered by the A. R. U. as a means of aiding the Pullman strikers:

"A labor organization in no way concerned in the case, and knowing nothing of it except what the one party is pleased to tell it, claims as its right and deems it its moral duty to ride into the lists, . . . solely on the strength of the fact that 'labor' is contending against capital. It thereby proclaims that partisanship is imperatively imposed upon 'labor.' It acts upon the maxim: Right or wrong, 'labor' must go with 'labor.' Starting from this maxim, it advances, step by step, to the other maxim: In contests between 'labor' and capital, 'labor' is enjoined from admitting that 'labor' can be wrong, or that capital can be right. This alone involves a radical revolution, for the fundamental economic fact of society as historically evolved is that capital and labor are not separate and distinct entities, but integral, thoroughly interdependent and inseparably intergrown parts of an organic whole."

"Labor" and "capital" are abstractions, and abstractions do not fight. The struggle is between workmen and employers and

no "radical revolution" is involved in the contention that the employers are always wrong in their differences with employees. The contention may be absurd, but it is not revolutionary. The workmen do not fight capital, but the present system of the distribution of the products of labor, of which they believe the employer unjustly obtains the lion's share. Such a belief is clearly not destructive of society, since society and the existing industrial system are by no means synonymous. The belief may be scientifically overthrown—or it may not; but there is nothing essentially anti-social in it. In the particular case of the A. R. U., those who ordered the sympathetic strike will not accept Prof. von Holst's version of the matter. They insist that they were thoroughly acquainted with the controversy in the Pullman strike, and that they were convinced of the justice of the strikers' case. True, they had no *direct* personal interest in the success of the Pullman strikers, but since when has selfishness been the only ethical, proper, and legal motive of action? A sympathetic strike may be wise or foolish, but it is never criminal except where criminal methods are employed—a proposition which is applicable to selfish strikes as well. The workmen who consider it their duty to strike sympathetically whenever any of their fellow-workmen are in trouble, are doubtless guilty of supreme folly, but they are perfectly right in claiming that they have the legal and moral *right* to order such strikes. A man is under no obligation to work for anybody in the absence of a contract; he may strike at any time and for any cause, as well as without cause. By so striking, he commits no aggression, no injustice to his fellows.

This opens the whole question of strikes and boycotts. Starting from the principle of justice, of equal freedom, all strikes and all boycotts, whether selfish or altruistic, are legitimate, provided no violence is used to coerce non-strikers or any other people. A striker is one who refuses to work for another. A boycotter is one who refuses to bestow his patronage, custom, or favor upon another. No man can set up a valid claim to a monopoly of my labor or my patronage, and no man can demand that I should give him "reasons" for declining to deal with him.

This, instead of being anti-social, is the first condition of social existence. The A. R. U. had a perfect right, legally and ethically, to say to the railroads: "We wish to aid our fellow-workmen in their struggle with the Pullman Company; we ask you not to haul Pullman cars; if you insist on hauling them, we must decline to continue in your employ." Of course they had no right to prevent other workmen from taking their places, but the use of violence is merely an accident in strikes, and does not affect the principle of the strike or boycott itself. The A. R. U. had the right to appeal to organized labor throughout the United States and persuade it to join the sympathetic strike, since, if it is not criminal to strike or boycott, it is not criminal to urge others to strike or boycott. The English law now clearly recognizes this, and provides that anything which is not criminal if done by one man shall not be deemed criminal when done by a combination of men, by a "conspiracy." This is perfectly consistent, not only with justice as I have defined it, but with the rules laid down by Prof. von Holst himself.

But what the professor chiefly relies on to support his charges against organized labor is their threat and boast that they can paralyze all industry and commerce by a universal strike and boycott. He exclaims:

"Gracious God! Society is to be henceforth at the mercy of every employer daring to exercise his legal right of refusing arbitration, for 'labor' will then, if it see fit, exercise its legal right in conformity with its moral duty, and completely paralyze society, even unto starvation, and what is even worse, unto all the mental and moral horrors attendant upon complete paralyzation. If this be not waging war upon society, what then is it?"

Whoever violates justice, whoever commits an aggression, is guilty of waging war upon society. But those who assert and vindicate their rightful freedom, who insist on being allowed to do what justice sanctions, are not enemies of society. "To paralyze industry" sounds ominously, but it is absolutely true that men have a perfect right to paralyze society and industry *if they can do without invasion or aggression*. It all depends on the *how*,

on the methods employed. A universal strike and boycott of employers by workmen would paralyze industry and society, but it would not be criminal. Men who remain purely passive, who do not force anybody by the use or threats of violence to obey their wishes, are not invaders. It is true that they injure innocent people, but the injury is indirect and the inevitable consequence of their defense of their legitimate freedom. It is not immoral or criminal to "injure" another; it is immoral to injure others in certain definite ways. An employer who discharges a poor workman when he has no need of his services may injure him and his family, but such injury is not immoral, because the employer is not bound to keep him. The manufacturer who, by introducing new machinery, throws hundreds out of employment, does them an injury, but he does not commit any ethical *wrong*. He exercises his right in using machinery in place of manual labor; if the laborers suffer, it is through no violation of justice on his part. Similarly, the strikers or boycotters who decline to work unless certain demands, which they have a right to make, are granted, while their acts may result in injury to others, are guilty of no wrong. Labor has the right to get the best terms possible, and to secure them by any means not in themselves invasive. Before we can pronounce a man an enemy of society for threatening to paralyze all industry and commerce, we must inquire *how he proposes to do it*. If he contemplates violence, he is a would-be aggressor; if he merely intends to refrain from giving his own services, and induce his friends by persuasion to aid him by withholding their services, he is neither immoral nor criminal.

Continuing his statement of the alleged outrageous and anti-social claims of labor, Prof. von Holst says:

"The federal government and the state governments must respect the humblest citizen's right of free locomotion. 'Labor' has the right to deprive the whole people of it, so far as locomotion depends on the modern means of communication. In the interest of the public the law imposes duties on common carriers. 'Labor' has the right to render the fulfillment of these duties impossible. It is the duty of the federal government to provide

a mail service for the people. It is the right of 'labor' to deprive them of it."

Yes, from the standpoint of justice, and even from the standpoint of that equality before the law which Prof. von Holst postulates, labor *has* the right to do either or all of these things, in spite of their injuriousness to the community. It appears paradoxical to affirm that labor may do what the state may not do consistently with justice, but the truth is that it is an utter fallacy to compare the duties of the state with the alleged duties of the laborers. When we say the state must respect man's right to locomotion, we merely mean that it may not forcibly interfere with men exercising this right. When Prof. von Holst inveighs against labor's right to deprive people of this right he does not refer to forcible interference, since nobody ever claimed such a right, but the refusal to operate railroads when the terms are unsatisfactory. Unless we are ready to take the position that it is the duty of railroad employees to operate trains under all circumstances, even when no wages are offered them, it is plain that they *have* the right to "deprive men of the right of locomotion" by refusing to operate trains whenever they see fit (apart from any contract, of course).

The right of free contract of disposing of one's time and labor is fundamental. He who maintains this right deprives no one of any right; he simply refuses to become a slave. Prof. von Holst talks about rights and liberty without attaching a definite meaning to these terms. Perhaps nothing more strikingly proves this than his assertion that "the very word 'scab' is an infamous outrage upon liberty and equality of rights." No epithet can be an outrage upon liberty unless it is libelous, unless it injures a man's reputation wrongfully. To call an honest man a thief is an outrage upon liberty, for a man has a right to his reputation. But to call a man a scab is simply to express contempt for him—a contempt which nobody shares who does not himself believe in organization of labor.

To sum up, Prof. von Holst has not proved or attempted to prove that the claims of organized labor, even as he puts them, are anti-social and infamous. Starting with the principle of

equal subjection to the law, he jumps to the conclusion that it is an outrage upon law and society to claim the right of peaceable strike or boycott—of paralyzing industry by *passive* resistance. He does not connect his conclusion with his premises; he does not show that an injury resulting from a mere assertion of a right is immoral. His charge that by the claim to peaceable strikes and boycotts—sympathetic or otherwise—labor threatens the vital principle of society and unfurls the banner of chaos and civil war falls to the ground.

When strikers or boycotters resort to violence, when they coerce others into joining them, they become aggressors, and, like all aggressors, violate the fundamental principle of society—justice. But so long as they confine themselves to the methods of peace, they are within their right, no matter what the consequences are of their conduct. If their vigilant defense of the right to free contract, to free association, and to passive resistance to what they deem inequitable, results in the paralysis of industry and the suffering of innocent parties, it merely shows that there is something wrong with a social system in which just conduct entails hardships. The peaceable striker and boycotter, like the man who introduces new machinery, is not to blame for the injury resulting from his legitimate action. To restrain him is to establish tyranny and destroy society.

"Are we awakened?" asks Prof. von Holst. No, we are not. Few of us are able to distinguish the just claims of labor from the unjust acts which unfortunately often accompany them. The real danger lies in our ignorance of true liberty, which betrays many of us into grave blunders, theoretical and practical. Prof. von Holst's attack upon labor will do much harm, for the workmen are apt to suspect malice where there is only logical confusion. To teach labor wisdom, it is necessary to evince readiness to do it justice. Not everything that labor *may* do is wise or helpful to it, but nothing will be gained, and much lost, by denying and resisting its rightful claims.

VICTOR YARROS.

THE THREATENED REVIVAL OF KNOWNOTHINGISM.

BY CHARLES ROBINSON.

TO LIBERAL and enlightened people, and even to those who are not liberal and enlightened, it must seem almost incredible that at the close of this nineteenth century, and in the greatest republic the world has ever known, a party founded upon bigotry should obtain a foothold in American politics. Such a party, however, is that disloyal secret society which burlesques its principles by calling itself the American Protective Association.

It is some forty years since our politics were cursed with the intrusion of such a faction, and then it was a short-lived madness. The speedy collapse of the Knownothing movement has passed into serio-comic history. Routed by Wise in Virginia, defeated by Johnson in Tennessee, scourged by Professor Johnson, and mercilessly scored by William H. Seward, it soon sunk into oblivion, covered with public opprobrium. "Before I would place my hands in the hands of other men," said Seward, "and bend my knee before them for any object, personal or political, I would pray God that that hand and that knee might become paralyzed, and that I might become the object of the pity, and even of the contempt of my fellow-men."*

The old Knownothing spirit seems to have been lately resuscitated. It appears under a new name, but with all the same malignity that animated the early "Proscriptionists" in their convent-burning and church-razing enterprises. The present movement is rather worse than the earlier one, in that it makes religious belief its basis exclusively. Its condemnation is laid directly upon those who hold the Catholic faith. The Know-nothings objected only to foreigners, but the A. P. A. ostracizes

*Quoted by the Rev. J. J. Tighe, of Boonton, N. J., in his admirable pamphlet on the A. P. A. movement.

Catholics, whether native Americans or not. It is not aimed at aliens, for among its bitterest propagandists are men but recently foreign subjects.

This A. P. A. agitation is simply the old Orange movement transplanted from the north of Ireland. Its chief promoters are Orangemen, and its aims, no matter how they may be cloaked, are the same old aims of the Orange society, which have proved such a prolific cause of riot, trouble, and bloodshed to the decent people of Great Britain.

So spoke the Rev. Robert Collyer in a recent interview. The accuracy of the statement is obvious. The "supreme president" of the concern, Mr. W. J. H. Traynor of Detroit, is a native of Brantford, Ontario; and in Michigan, where the A. P. A. claims to have such a strong hold, the greater part of its members are likewise foreigners. Most of the Orangemen who swell its ranks have not given up their allegiance to Great Britain and have no apparent intention of so doing. Thus, one of the leaders of the organization in Nebraska, a Canadian by birth, did not consider citizenship worth the papers until elected sheriff of Douglas County in 1891. In order to qualify and enjoy the emoluments of that position, however, he became a citizen after his election. During the two years succeeding, he was among the most vociferous of the A. P. A. patriots, but since defeated for reelection last November, he seems to have lost all interest in the perpetuity of American institutions. Nearly all the A. P. A. organs, which are now fairly boiling over with "Americanism" so-called, were, until the proscription became a source of profit, Orange organs. Indeed, the movement is known to have been prompted largely by Canadian Orangemen and to be in close sympathy with Orange lodges, thus importing into our national life a wholly foreign feud. Ireland's history is a threnody of tears because of Orangeism, and the future history of the United States would be written in letters of blood were A. P. A.ism to take root here. Happily, however, this is impossible. No such fraternity can ever flourish on our free soil. It may, however, spread wide enough to do incalculable mischief.

The dubious honor of being the birthplace of the A. P. A. in

the United States has been claimed for various localities. According to "Supreme Vice-President" Adam Fawcett of Columbus, Ohio,* its *acte de naissance* took place "in Clinton, Iowa, about six years ago"; but it is only within the past eighteen months that it has become a real factor in politics. It now exists all over the country, being particularly powerful on the Pacific coast; its greatest strength, however, is understood to be in the Mississippi Valley states, from Ohio to Kansas. Until a very recent date the A. P. A. has confined its operations mainly to the West, but its emissaries are now flooding the eastern states with their incendiary literature, and are following this up with the institution of lodges in which, if the fuglemen of the order are to be believed, members are being secretly received by the thousands weekly.

These members are animated by the bitterest bigotry; they are ruled by demagogues and are misled by ignorance. They feed on the utterances of such miscalled ministers as the Rev. Madison C. Peters, and as a result are prepared to find a pistol and a poniard in the pocket of every priest and an arsenal in every Catholic church. To them assertions are proof, and abuse conviction. They believe implicitly that the time has come when every Protestant should keep a loaded rifle in his house; and they regard their Catholic neighbors as "papist plotters," whose only aim is to destroy the national and state governments, in order that the pope may come over from Italy, set up the Vatican in Washington, and put every Protestant to the knife. They also firmly believe that the "Romanists" really control the army and the navy and the heads of the departments at Washington. In the West the A. P. A. lecturers have so far played on the credulity of their deluded hearers as to aver that the pope personally superintended the killing of Mayor Miller of South Omaha two years ago. Catholics, they declare, are permitted unmolested to revel in crime, while Catholic policemen stand ready to strike down inoffending Protestant citizens; and that it is even growing dangerous for Protestants to hold an open-air meeting lest the conference be broken up with rotten

*See his article in *The Century*, July, 1894.

eggs and brickbats, supplemented with bullets. The following extract from the *Chicago Herald* serves as a sample of one of these discourses :

"Professor" Walter Sims, probably the most prominent figure in the A. P. A., lectured in Central Music Hall yesterday afternoon. The hall was filled even to the galleries, almost as many women as men being present. They cheered when the speaker declared Abraham Lincoln was "slain with a bullet cast in a Jesuit mold," when President Carnot's assassination was credited to Roman Catholic influence, and when President Cleveland was pronounced a tool of the pope.

Mr. Peters himself, speaking in a similar strain at the Bloomingdale Reformed church, New York, on April 23, said :

Grover Cleveland's chief adviser is Cardinal Gibbons, and that may account for the ignominious failure of the present administration.

Commenting on this statement the *New York Times* remarked :

It is fair to suppose that Mr. Peters believed that there were some among his congregation who would believe this statement, delivered in the house of God as truth.

In his *Century* article already referred to, Mr. Fawcett asserts that the A. P. A. "is a strictly political, non-partisan order," and that "it interferes with no man's religious motives." This fustian declamation is in direct conflict with the statements made almost simultaneously by Mr. Traynor in the *North American Review*, which conclusively confirm the well-founded belief that the A. P. A. is a politico-sectarian organization with one fixed aim—the political and commercial proscription of Catholics. The application of this religious test, as the *Louisville Courier-Journal* has pointed out, is the distinctive and essential principle of A. P. A.ism, all other things being either secondary or ignored. Its members are solemnly sworn never to employ a Catholic in any capacity, to oppose Catholics for "any office in the gift of the American people," and to "endeavor at all times to place the political positions of this government in the hands of Protestants." This oath is in itself a self-confessed act of treason against the republic, since it is decreed by the Constitution (Art. VI., Sec. 3) that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under the United States." And President Eliot, of Harvard, in a recent article *

**Forum*, October, 1894.

on the possible endurance of the American Republic, finds the chief hope for its permanence in this principle of religious toleration.

The A. P. A. has thus been the means of driving a large number of Catholics out of office, both elective and appointive, and has also brought about the discharge of numerous Catholic employees. The Catholic citizens of Detroit, Milwaukee, and Kansas City (all strongly Democratic) allowed this insidious foe to gain a foothold, and before they knew it the A. P. A., under the guise of Republicanism, captured these cities, which are now practically ruled by it; and native Americans who were Catholics have been everywhere discharged. Indeed, Detroit has now hardly one Catholic appointed official left, for wherever the authorities could displace a Catholic, they have done so. As another illustration of this insolent intolerance, only a few weeks ago (on September 19) Mayor Hayes, of Lynn, Mass., was "turned down" for a congressional nomination simply because he voted for an appropriation for the Catholic House of the Good Shepherd when he was a member of the state House of Representatives four years ago.

In its campaign of calumny the A. P. A. has paid fraudulent or unfrocked priests and "escaped" nuns to travel about and pour forth a flood of false and obscene abuse upon Catholic citizens, who form one sixth of the nation, and who, as clerical or lay folk, mind their own business and abide by the laws. It passes comprehension that such outrageously obscene "literature" as emanates from the A. P. A. is permitted to be circulated. Dr. Parkhurst and Mr. Comstock, in their zeal for the public morals, could not do better than to devote their energies to suppressing it.

That the A. P. A. has already fomented several riots, with the result of killing a number of persons, goes without saying. Not long since one of its lecturers entered a hall in Kansas City carrying a loaded rifle, and called for twelve stout Protestants as a bodyguard. He then proceeded, in the foulest terms imaginable, to denounce Catholics generally, but such of them as heard him, although intensely indignant, denied him the coveted opportu-

ity of firing his rifle and bringing on a fight. Still more recently, in Columbus, the A. P. A. threatened to break into a convent there—which it had about as much right to attempt as it would have to forcibly invade a Methodist minister's dwelling or a Presbyterian orphan asylum. The Catholic authorities, however, acting solely in the interest of the public peace, opened the convent to a committee, who went through it and ascertained that there were neither dungeons nor instruments of torture to be found there. So again, on September 29, a well-known Republican politician and A. P. A. man, in an address before the Unity Club, at Los Angeles, averred that under the Catholic cathedral in that city there were five hundred stands of arms, whereupon a prominent contractor in the audience rose and declared the statement to be a lie, offering to give a thousand dollar bill, which he displayed to the A. P. A., if it could be proved. The lecturer then stated that he "had been told" that the arms were there.

But "accusing is proving when malice and envy are judges," and the A. P. A. still continues its defamations in this direction. Thus Mr. Traynor* asserts that "arms in Catholic churches is a matter that needs neither confirmation nor refutation," and that "arms are actual and visible auxiliaries of the papal church." How baseless such charges are is demonstrated by Elbert Hubbard in an article entitled "The New Disease," published in the *June Arena*, from which the following is an extract :

For a year I have endeavored to find proof that the Catholic Church in America was arming and drilling men or countenancing such action, as so boldly stated by the leaders in the A. P. A. In many cities I have been given permission to search every part of convents, monasteries, and churches, where arms were said to be stored. In vain has been my search. I have used all methods known to detectives to find any Catholic in possession of orders to maltreat his neighbors. No request or suggestion or hint showing a desire to injure Protestants have I ever been able to trace to a Catholic priest, bishop, or other dignitary. And it is now the conclusion of all unprejudiced men who have investigated the matter that the letters, "encyclicals," "bulls," and orders which are being printed in various A. P. A. papers, and purporting to come from the Roman Catholic Church, are flagrant forgeries. The A. P. A. seeks to spread hate. It thrives by fear and its only weapon is untruth.

**North American Review*, July, 1894.

As Bishop Spalding has pointed out, the Catholic Church has no hidden policy or deep-laid schemes. "Our life," he says, "is undisguised, our churches are open to all, our books may be had by every one. Whosoever desires information about us has not far to seek." Moreover, the Catholic Church has never attempted to dictate to her adherents in civil matters, nor has she sought control of political parties. Indeed, as De Tocqueville has demonstrated, there are no more ardent adherents to this policy of separation than the Catholic clergy, because they fully appreciate that their religious influence is augmented in proportion as their abstention from politics is absolute; and it is because the Catholic laity recognize the reciprocal advantages produced by such an arrangement that they are at once the most faithful believers and the most zealous citizens.

Having rung all the changes on the gamut of representation, the A. P. A. has not hesitated to circulate spurious documents, which they have attributed to Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Ireland, and other Catholic prelates, who are represented as "viewing with alarm" the "spread of education" and the "rapid diffusion of the English language," and as urging the crowding out of American heretics from employment in every enterprise requiring labor. In one of these bogus documents, purporting to be the translation of an encyclical, dated Christmas Day, 1891, Pope Leo is made to issue this astounding proclamation:

We proclaim the people of the United States to have forfeited all right to rule said republic, and also all dominion, dignity, and privileges appertaining to it. We likewise declare that all subjects of rank and condition in the United States, and every individual who has taken any oath of loyalty to the United States in any way whatever, may be absolved from said oath, as also from all duty, fidelity, or obedience, on or about September 5, 1893, when the Roman Catholic Congress shall convene at Chicago, Ill., as we shall exonerate them from all engagements; and on or about the feast of Ignatius Loyola, in the year of our Lord 1893, it will be the duty of the faithful to exterminate all heretics from within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Among other such forgeries are a number of statements attributed to Father Hecker, the celebrated founder of the Paulist community, who was made to give utterance to such absurd

sayings as, "We will take this country, and build our institutions over the grave of Protestantism."

Well may the Rev. Washington Gladden ask, as he does in *The Century* : *

Could any rational Protestant expect Roman Catholics to send their children to schools under the control of men who have disseminated these forgeries?

A few other unprejudiced and patriotic, non-Catholic public men, like Dr. Gladden, have denounced the A. P. A. with vigor. In this article he further says :

Can we afford as Protestants to approve by our silence such methods of warfare against Roman Catholics as this society is employing? May I not venture to call upon all intelligent Protestants, and especially upon Protestant clergymen, to consider well their responsibilities in relation to this epidemic? For the honor of Protestantism, is it not high time to separate ourselves from this class of "patriots"? In any large town, if the leading Protestant clergymen will speak out clearly, the plague will be stayed or abated.

How true this last assertion is is made manifest by the result wherever the course suggested has been followed. In May last the broad-minded Protestant clergymen of Columbus addressed a remarkable letter to the people of Ohio, urging them to disenfranchise themselves from the yoke of fear and bigotry which the A. P. A. had fastened on their necks. In this strong, manly protest they say :

We make these statements not only in the interests of truth and decency and common humanity, but also in the interest of Protestantism. And we call upon all Protestant gentlemen in every community to acquaint themselves with the literature which is being secretly disseminated among the ignorant Protestants of their neighborhood, and to speak out about it, as every man of honor is bound to do.

After demonstrating the falsity of the outrageous charges made against the Catholics, this letter concludes :

Our Roman Catholic neighbors, though suffering grievously under these wicked slanders, are quietly going about their daily work, waiting for this epidemic of prejudice and passion to abate. It is not likely that their love for Protestants will be increased by the experience through which they are now passing, but their patience under this trial has been exemplary.

So again in Omaha, where a similar state of terror was worked

* "The Anti-Catholic Crusade," March, 1894.

up by the A. P. A., the leading Protestant clergymen took the matter in hand, and as a result of the good fight waged by them, the backbone of the movement there is broken. Preëminent among these champions of religious freedom was the Rev. John Williams, rector of St. Barnabas Protestant Episcopal church, who, in a recent number of *The Parish Messenger*, a little paper published in the interests of his church, writes:

Now there is to be, it seems, a change of front; the ex-priests are to be frowned upon, the abuse of Roman Catholics is to cease, and Canadians and Orangemen are to be retired from leadership, and none but genuine Americans placed on guard. That would have been good policy if it had been pursued from the start, but now it is a little too late. The infamy of the A. P. A. is too infamous for fair-minded, honest Americans to continue it, even on the proposed lines of reform. Besides, the retirement of Canadians and Orangemen from its leadership means the dismissal of the authors and star actors of the play.

The Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster, of Grace church, Brooklyn, speaking about Mr. Williams' campaign against the A. P. A., says:

He never gave them a moment's rest, and made such a rattling warfare on them that they never had a breathing spell. I have watched the A. P. A. movement out West, and I know how strong the organization is there. Any sign that it is losing ground in any locality is cause for general rejoicing.

Mr. Brewster himself took the A. P. A. as the text for his sermon on July 4 last, considering the occasion a most fit one to warn his congregation against the organization, which he branded as un-American because incompatible with the fundamental principles of American constitutional liberty.

Among other fair-minded Protestant ministers who set the seal of their disapproval upon the A. P. A. movement may be mentioned the Rev. Charles H. Eaton, rector of the Church of the Divine Paternity, New York, who recently declared that all Protestants should condemn the organization because it is not American in principle or in its life. "We have no right," he said, "to organize against a class of believers, even though we may have the smallest sympathy with their form of worship." So again the Rev. Mason North, one of the leaders in the Methodist missionary work in New York, said, "To proscribe Roman Catholic citizens for their opinions is, in my opinion, a relic of the dark ages."

In a recent letter the Rev. Howard McQueary says :

The A. P. A. is nothing but a revival of Knownothingism in its worst form, and it should be condemned by every lover of his country and of his fellow-men, and all true patriots should "speak out" now, and let it be known where they stand.

The Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott, the Rev. Dr. Meredith, the Rev. Dr. Storrs, the Rev. E. Walpole Warren, and the Rev. Dr. Rainsford, and a few other representative leaders of Protestantism, have also heartily denounced the A. P. A., its literature, and its general course of action. The great majority of the clergy, however, have remained silent, thus indicating tacit approval of a religious proscription which, were it attempted against any Protestant denomination, would arouse a din of remonstrance. Some of these preachers of the "gospel of peace" have even sought to fan the flame of religious hatred, and a not inconsiderable section of the Protestant religious press has largely abetted the unchristian aim of the A. P. A. by reëchoing the wholly false utterances for which it is responsible.

The Rev. H. P. Mendes, rabbi of the Congregation of Shearith Israel, New York, thus indicates how the movement is regarded by his people :

This is no country for any political action proscribing or supporting on religious grounds. We cannot tolerate here any attempt at religious domination. It is pitiful, it is awful, to see men oppose each other on the ground of religion.

So again Julius Harburger, Grand Master of the Independent Free Sons of Israel, referring to the A. P. A., in a recent address at New York, said :

The leading men of other creeds, non-Catholic, should be brave and fearless, and at gatherings ought to express their abhorrence at its pernicious doctrines.

It is a notable fact that all the Jewish papers in the United States, both orthodox and liberal, vigorously condemn the A. P. A. Says the *American Hebrew* in a recent issue :

The obnoxious A. P. A., which is seeking, by concerted action among Protestant Christians, to disfranchise and ostracize all Catholics, seems to be thriving apace. Even in the large cities, where the spirit of charity and tolerance and patriotism might be thought to subordinate the sway of bigotry, the Protestant press and pulpit seem to hesitate, either

tacitly forbearing or boldly supporting the benighted tenets of the A. P. A., and but sparsely coming out with any degree of courage or emphasis in opposition to them. Sooner or later our Protestant friends—those who are influential in Protestant circles—will be compelled to declare themselves on either one side or the other. Before long the conflict will be definitely drawn on the lines of Protestantism *versus* American citizenship. That has a very ugly look in politics, and the only way to avoid it is for influential Protestants to use their power to crush out this outrageous attempt to inject religion as a factor in our political life.

Colonel Ingersoll, too, has put himself on record* regarding the A. P. A. in the following terms :

In this country, I see no need of secret political societies. I think it better to fight in the open field. I am a believer in religious liberty, in allowing all sects to preach their doctrines and to make as many converts as they can. As long as we have free speech and a free press I think there is no danger of the country being ruled by any church.

Infuriated by the independent attitude of the broad-minded non-Catholics who have raised their voices against it, the A. P. A. has recently threatened, through one of its official organs, *The American Patriot*, to "break down" any Protestant minister who stands in its way, and declares that "such men should be treated as were the Copperheads in war time." President Traynor's diatribe in the *North American Review*, already referred to, shows in almost every line the writer's anxiety to "preserve the republic from papist domination." He quotes from encyclicals of Pius IX. and Leo XIII., from the works of Cardinal Manning, and from other documents, to prove that the papacy claims complete sovereignty over the state. He further cites the decrees of the councils of Baltimore, as well as a declaration of Bishop Foley, affirming the actual force of a condemnation of heretics promulgated in the thirteenth century ; also a passage from St. Thomas Aquinas to the intent that heretics are not to be tolerated ; and a writer in the *Catholic World* asserting the supremacy of the church in matters of education, in the censorship of ideas, in the control of books and the press ; and he calls attention to the proceedings of the American Mechanics and other Catholic corporations as evidence that there was urgent need for an organization in defense of American liberty.

*Interview in New York *Herald*, September 18.

The Scranton (Pa.) *Truth* furnished a terse explanation of Mr. Traynor's anxiety in this direction in the following paragraph :

The president of the A. P. A. is a Canadian and an Orangeman. This explains his burning anxiety to save the United States "from pope and popery, brass money, and wooden shoes."

The fact that most of the statements to which Mr. Traynor commits himself in this article have no foundation in either principle or fact, in the teachings of the church or the practice of her faithful children, doubtless makes little difference to the "supreme" head of an organization which is built upon a foundation of falsehood. "*Male facere qui vult, nusquam non invenit causam.*"

In the following (August) number of the *North American Review*, Mr. George Parsons Lathrop refutes the assertions of Mr. Traynor, and with much force and clearness shows the absolute absurdity of his positions. He defends the allegiance of American Catholics, which he shows to be by no means inconsistent with a sincere acceptance of the church's teachings, and cites among other authorities Dr. Byrne's work on the "Catholic Doctrine of Faith and Morals" to prove that every Catholic is bound by a solemn sense of duty to obey the civil law and the state authorities. In reply to this time-honored and oft-exploded calumny, that Catholics cannot at the same time be loyal subjects both of the pope and of the state, Bishop Spalding also demonstrates that the obedience of Catholics is confined to the domain of religious faith, morals, and discipline; and since the state claims no jurisdiction over such matters, there can be no question of conflict. The pope has never attempted to interfere in the civil or political affairs of this country, and if he attempted so to do, his action would be resented by Catholics more quickly than by others. Yet withal Bishop Doane tells us that the "pronounced principles of the Roman Church gave the church a right to control the political actions of its members. Verily, it seems incredible that so distinguished a churchman should seriously assert such a monstrous doctrine. It is only to be equaled by Mr. Traynor's pronunciamento that a person "who professes to be a citizen of

the United States and a subject of Rome is an anomaly, dangerous alike to the republic and to the papacy."*

If, as Cicero tells us, history is the voice of truth, then this claim is obviously preposterous. It is sufficiently refuted by the memory of those Catholic patriots whose names are written on every page of our history, from the time of Lord Baltimore, who appointed a Protestant governor over the colony of Maryland, down to the present day, and who are only types of thousands of humbler citizens who share their religion. In his general hatred of the "papal church," however, Mr. Traynor seems either to forget or to ignore the fact that Catholics were the earliest champions of religious liberty under the colonial régime.† And the church still includes a large number of people who are quite as well qualified to talk about the "American flag" as himself or any other of his supreme band of imported Orange patriots from Canada. As the *Scranton Truth* says :

Before the A. P. A. can exterminate the Catholics of the United States, they will have to blot out Columbus and the cross of Christ; they will have to tear the names of the Catholic Carroll from the Declaration of Independence; they will have to sever the friendship of Catholic France from the immortal Washington in the War of the Revolution; they will have to blot out the brilliant achievements of Sheridan and hosts of other Catholic soldiers who breasted Confederate steel in the struggle for the Union.

In addition to the articles by Bishop Spalding, Mr. Lathrop, and Dr. Gladden already quoted, two other valuable papers on the A. P. A. appeared in the July number of the *Forum*, written respectively by Frederick R. Coudert, the eminent lawyer, who is a Catholic, and by Prof. J. B. McMasters, the well-known historian, who is not, both of which prove beyond question that the A. P. A. is an uncalled-for, mischievous body, whose methods are a peril to the community in which they are practiced. Indeed, the case against the A. P. A. is so ably presented by the four writers mentioned that there is nothing left to be added to their impeachment of it. There is

* *North American Review*, September, 1894.

† Bancroft's "History of the United States" (edition of 1870, Vol. I., p. 255).

just one point, however, on which none of them seem to have touched, and that is the manner in which the A. P. A. has stepped into the shoes of the Republican party, and, snubbing its leaders, has forced the older organization to walk as it directs. Indeed, the Republican leaders and managers stand appalled in the presence of this secret force. Witness this dispatch to the *New York Sun*, dated New Haven, September 27 :

The strength and power of the American Protective Association is not only astonishing but alarming to the leaders of the old parties. This is noticeably so in the Republican caucuses, the managers of the machine for many years being cast ruthlessly aside by the efforts of the members of the A. P. A.

So shrewdly and effectively has the capture of the Republican party been made by the A. P. A., that in not a few states Republican success in the forthcoming elections will mean nothing more than the success of the new Knownothingism, with all which that implies. So far, therefore, as Republicanism triumphs throughout the country, so far can the A. P. A. claim the victory. "To my mind," said John Boyd Thacher in a recent speech, "the issue of religious intolerance is the one vital, absorbing question of the campaign." Indeed, at the present moment, Republicanism has been sent to the rear, and Knownothingism has come to the front, masquerading under the borrowed name.

The Cheyenne (Wyo.) *Leader* hits the nail very hard on the head when it declares that the new movement is really but another form of the Republican party. "The kite," it says, "is branded A. P. A., the tail G. O. P."

Colonel Richard C. Kerens of Missouri, who is a member of the Republican National Committee from that state, and the author of the now famous resolution calling upon his party to denounce the A. P. A., which was presented to the state convention at Excelsior Springs, Mo., on August 15, has watched the advance of this movement and warned his party friends of its dangers, which some of them had failed to recognize. In an interview published in the *New York Tribune* of September 1, Mr. Kerens says:

My object in putting forth this resolution was to prevent A. P. A.ism from becoming an issue in the politics of the country this year. The doctrines of the A. P. A. are so un-American as to be really unworthy of the importance of being made an issue, and yet they are dangerous, just as the careless words of Burchard in 1884, "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion," effected the defeat of Mr. Blaine and the Republican party. Their principles, when they become understood, will perish of their own malignity and unsavoriness. I think that now is the time for the Republican party to stand up squarely, and manfully face this conspiracy and put it down.

Mr. Kerens subsequently endeavored to have an anti-A. P. A. plank inserted in the New York State platform, but although his efforts were ably seconded by Mr. Patrick Egan, Senator O'Connor, Commissioner Kerwin, and General O'Beirne, the Saratoga Convention (which had one hundred and ten A. P. A. men among its delegates and three of them on the platform committee) refused, and put itself squarely on record in favor of religious intolerance and bigotry, thus establishing most decisively the kinship of the A. P. A. and the Republican party. The truth is that the two organizations are now so interlocked that if the Republican party declared itself against the A. P. A. it would declare against a part of itself. "No Republican convention," says the *Chicago Times*, "dare adopt a platform denouncing the A. P. A. . . . The Republican party is not only affiliated with the A. P. A.; it is dominated by it." This fact is clearly demonstrated by the following extracts, which are taken at random from newspapers in different parts of the country, and which will prove interesting reading to those who feel doubtful as to the party that stands behind the A. P. A. Speaking of the election of Carter, a Republican, to the Supreme Court of the state, the Rockford (Ill.) *Star* says :

The A. P. A. voted solidly for Carter, and undoubtedly in some portions of the district intimidated voters, inducing many who would not vote for Carter to stay at home. No fact in the history of the state of Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas is more shameful than that a secret Knownothing association should be able to exert in a judicial contest influence great enough to make an apparent reversal of party majorities. In rural districts this sort of intimidation is much more effectual than in large cities. The infamy of a national political party professing to respect the principles of the Constitution of the United States allying itself with an un-American and cowardly association to

deprive a portion of the citizenship of the country of its political rights was never equaled in the past of American politics. In so far as the Republicans won in the fourth district with this infamous ally, they are welcome to their victory.

In Wyoming the same close relation exists between the "Americans" and the Republicans. They work together like brethren, and this alliance is perfectly understood by everybody, as is shown by a recent editorial in the *Cheyenne Leader*, which describes the A. P. A. as "a Republican annex." Referring to the political affiliation between these two great engines of reform in the Northwest, the *Boston Republic* says :

Evidently the A. P. A. is getting possession of the Republican machine in Wisconsin. It will force the nomination of its candidates and dictate the policy and the platform. If a majority of the Republicans are members of the A. P. A., the Republican party is not worth the support of any decent man.

Wisconsin has capitulated in many districts to the A. P. A., and the Republican machine out there is entirely in its control. To quote the *La Crosse Chronicle* :

The Douglas County Republican Convention was a strictly A. P. A. affair, as every act of that party is at Superior.

The same story is told by the Indianapolis *Sentinel*, which says :

The A. P. A. captured all the Republican nominations on the county ticket at Chicago. We sympathize with Chicago in this affliction. Indianapolis is suffering in the same way.

Says the *Atlanta Journal* :

The *Journal* has frequently discussed the A. P. A., and has taken occasion to condemn that organization as opposed to the spirit of our institutions. In arriving at this conclusion, we have not accepted the professions of the association as to its aims and purposes, but have judged it by its conduct. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

The feeling in New Orleans in reference to the A. P. A. is expressed by the *Picayune*, which says (June 5) that A. P. A.ism "is growing dangerous and should be looked into." The *Denver News* avers that "the A. P. A.'s have a grip on the G. O. P.," and the Yankton (S. D.) *Herald* published a long specific statement on June 7 that the A. P. A. had entered into secret deals with the Republicans in that state ; while the Brooklyn *Citizen*, in a recent editorial, states that "the leaders of the Re-

publican party have been acting in concert with the A. P. A. throughout the country." And so it goes.

Further evidence that the A. P. A. is a dangerous element in our political life may be found in the petition addressed to Congress by Mr. H. M. Youmans of Saginaw, Mich., the Democratic candidate for Congress from his district, who was defeated by the A. P. A. (allied as usual with the Republican party) in a manner to make every decent American ashamed. In the course of a debate arising out of this contest, Representative Weadock read to the House some astounding statements about the A. P. A. in Colorado, relating how Mayor Van House of Denver, because he appointed a Catholic as chief of police, was denounced by the organization which adopted resolutions, among which it was

Resolved, that all communication, socially or otherwise, with said traitor and perjurer by any member of this organization do forever cease.

Resolved, that when his carcass reposes in the arms of Mother Earth, in whatever land, an unknown committee, duly appointed, shall perform the last rite in the name of the council by marking the place so that all may know

.....
 HERE LIES A TRAITOR.

If this sort of thing be "patriotism," as its apologists aver, then Dr. Johnson has well declared patriotism to be the last refuge of a scoundrel.

During a speech of Gov. McKinley at Kansas City on October 2, some one asked, "What's the matter with the A. P. A.?" According to the *New York Advertiser's* report, "The governor paused for a moment before replying, then said, 'The question we have to settle now is, What is the matter with the country.'" While the Republican leaders, by thus dodging the issue, have confirmed the story of their close association with the A. P. A., the Democrats on every side are going manfully on record as being against it. Commenting on the long and bitter debate on the Indian School question last spring, the *Boston Republic* said:

It was made quite plain during the long and bitter struggle that the alliance between the Republican party and the secret anti-Catholic

societies is being more and more closely cemented. The Democrats, true to the traditions of their party, stood squarely in opposition to religious bigotry and intolerance. Speaker Crisp placed a prominent Catholic member in the chair, and thus defied the united powers of conspiracy and darkness. The splendid support given to Mr. O'Neil by his Democrat associates proved that the party can be counted upon to fight religious persecution in the future as it did in the past.

Bearing on this point also, the Nashville (Tenn.) *American* says :

A Democrat is a lover of civil and religious liberty, and the Democratic party, in every stage of its career, has always fought for and maintained these principles. A member of the so-called A. P. A., a secret, oath-bound, political party, under his oath, is not and cannot be a lover of civil and religious liberty ; for his party teaches and insists upon its members proscribing other American citizens because of their religion. Therefore it is that a true member of the A. P. A. cannot be a true and loyal Democrat.

The attitude of the Democrats toward the A. P. A. has been further made plain by the recorded utterances of such pronounced non-Catholic members of the party as Governors Stone and Peck, Ex-Governor Hoadley, William H. Peckham, Oscar S. Straus, and Edward M. Shepard. Mr. Shepard's words on this subject are especially felicitous. He says :

The movement has not near the strength that is claimed for it, and is certain to be far more ephemeral than the Knownothing movement. I am myself a strong Protestant ; but the strongest Protestant, if an intelligent and honest man, must admit the enormous services to piety and good morals rendered in this country by the church against which this movement of intolerance is directed.

So far as public affairs are concerned, no religious body has contained men who have rendered more distinguished and more unselfish patriotic service than members of the Catholic Church have during the whole history of the American government, and especially at the present time. There is not a sound political principle, there is no single reform which makes for righteousness in public affairs, among whose firmest and sincerest promoters are not numbered our fellow-citizens of the Catholic faith.

It is well enough for us Protestants to remember that the great majority of our political knaves, whether in federal, state, or local politics, have been, like Tweed, men professing to be sincere Protestants. We had better remember that in modern times, as was the case between three and four hundred years ago, it has more than once happened that Sir Thomas More has been a Catholic and Henry VIII. a Protestant.

No less trenchant is this truism from the *Brooklyn Eagle* :

The knowledge of every thoughtful man proves that Roman Catholicism of itself is no bar to excellent civic work for America, and Protestantism is no assurance in itself of such work. A nation which trusted Philip Sheridan, a Roman Catholic, as one of its great soldiers, against Episcopal Lee and Presbyterian Stonewall Jackson, who sought to divide it, should leave to owls and to bats the creation of sectarian lines of cleavage or scare in public affairs.

Everywhere, in fact, both the Democratic leaders and the Democratic press are pronouncing against the A. P. A. The *New York Times* in particular has rendered an inestimable public service by dragging into the light of publicity the operations of this disloyal secret organization, which is working like a mole under the surface of politics.

Says the *Scranton Truth* :

It will not be the fault of this pestiferous and fanatical association if there is not a religious war in this country, for its false assertions and wild appeals to prejudice are of that firebrand sort that inflame the passions of the unthinking. Happily, however, there is too much intelligence and common sense in the land to permit the success of the A. P. A.'s propaganda of assassination. The appeals that are often successful in provoking religious riots and bloodshed in the cities of the Old World cannot succeed here, where Catholics, Protestants, and Jews are dwelling together in peace, and working out the destinies of mankind as members of one great family, bound together by the brotherhood of citizenship.

Even the *New York Mail and Express*, which has certainly never been over friendly to Catholics, says :

To the zealots of American patriotism we say that they should remember that this is a land of freedom ; a country where there must be the utmost respect paid to conscience and religious convictions ; and that no political party can survive which is based upon the un-American doctrine of religious proscription. There must be mutual recognition of the rights of all parties.

It has been suggested by some well-meaning but ill-advised enthusiast that American Catholics should form an organization in opposition to the A. P. A. Such a step would be a most serious blunder. As the *Catholic Standard* says :

There is no place or need for a Catholic political party in this country. The federal and state constitutions are in harmony with Christian Catholic principles and with any political party which loyally upholds the Constitution. With us the church is independent

of the state, and will remain independent. With us, therefore, political parties have no concern with religious affairs except to preserve the liberty of religion and to resist any attempt to burden the citizen with pains or penalties in the exercise of his freedom of conscience.

Catholics will not establish a C. P. A., or Catholic Protective Association. They are loyal citizens of the United States, and will, therefore, enter into no combination against any of their non-Catholic fellow-citizens. On the contrary, as Monsignor Schroeder of the Catholic University at Washington declared in a recent address before the German Catholic Central Verein, Catholics "are tolerant in the true sense of the word, and are ready to protect the religious liberty of all their fellow-citizens of any creed even until the last drop of their blood is shed."

The remedy for A. P. A.ism lies in the Constitution and laws of our country and in the intelligence and good-will of its non-Catholic citizens; for in the long run, there is no more truth-seeking and impartial man in the world than the average American. As Bishop Spalding says in his admirable article already quoted, "The American people love justice and fair play; they live and let live; their very genius is good-will to men."

Meanwhile, however, A. P. A.ism is hurtful to the best interests of the country. It separates friend from friend; it sows the seed of suspicion and distrust; it makes innocent victims, and diverts attention from the momentous problems which are pressing upon us. Heaven knows there are enough legitimate issues in American politics to engage the minds of the people and to busy legislators without injecting into it these issues of religion. The country is, indeed, in a perfect maelstrom of great economic problems, and he is an enemy of mankind who seeks to turn the people away from these to involve them in religious feuds. All churches should rather carry a flag of truce on ecclesiastical differences, and unite against those forces which are directed against all forms of religion.

Any conspiracy directed against Catholics taking part in public affairs must inevitably react hurtfully upon its authors. As the *New York Times* says:

Any party that should openly or in any effective degree secretly con-

nive to shut out Catholics from its nominations would invite certain disaster.

The present Catholic boycott may, therefore, be safely left to work out its own destruction. It is only one of those periodical waves of bigotry which roll their harmless tide against the everlasting rock of Peter.

" Truth crushed to earth shall rise again ;
The eternal years of God are hers."

Error and evil cannot stand the light of day ; they flourish only under cover and in the dark. The A. P. A. has grown to large proportions solely because it has done its work in secrecy. The membership list of two million of which it brags has been stealthily obtained, mainly by coercion and boycott. The living lie upon which this movement is built may for a while deceive a few, and cause others to hesitate ; but it is only a question of time before the A. P. A., like its forerunner, Know-nothingism, shall be stamped out of existence. It may be that it has not yet reached its culmination ; but it is not likely to go far. " It must in the end defeat its own object," says the *Boston Herald*. As Horace Greeley said of the Know-nothing party, " You might as well seek to perpetuate an anti-cholera or potato-rot party."

While it is true that elections, not only in New England but throughout the West, have been considerably affected by the A. P. A. movement, it is also true that these passing victories of bigotry and uncharitableness have invariably been followed by a speedy reaction in the direction of honest citizenship and true religion. Said Representative Heard of Missouri the other day :

The A. P. A. is being worked for all it is worth by the Republicans, but the Democrats are fighting them openly and vigorously, and I do not think that much damage will be done by the introduction of bigotry into the campaign.

Before long the Republicans who favor the A. P. A. plan of influencing votes will awake to the fact that they have been playing with fire ; and once the country is thoroughly aroused against these dark-lantern, political assassins with whom the

Republicans are consorting, the alliance cannot fail to receive the condemnation at the polls which it deserves. It is obvious that the A. P. A. could never have attained any power at all except for its coalition with the Republicans. This, however, is no new story. The Republican party has always been the patron of every form of religious bigotry. It was the sole heir and residuary legatee of the original Knownothing party, from which, indeed, it was largely recruited. Its managers in its decline now only go back to first principles. As the *Saratoga Sun* says :

Such a movement as this A. P. A. would have no strength whatever had it not been encouraged and utilized by the discredited and desperate leaders of the Republican party, who have been repeatedly beaten upon all the legitimate issues before the country.

That all this is not mere idle talk is demonstrated by the fact that the A. P. A. has only grown to be a factor in those places where it has worked with the Republican party. The course to pursue, therefore, is to hold the Republican party responsible for its existence, and to punish it accordingly.

CHARLES ROBINSON.

A NON-PARTISAN VIEW OF THE TARIFF SITUATION AND OUTLOOK.

BY ERNEST E. RUSSELL.

THE progress of events and of discussion with regard to the tariff question during the last two weeks of August developed what at first glance appears to be a curious paradox. A general tariff bill has been passed, and it is as certain as anything in the political future can be that general tariff revision will not be undertaken again for some years ; and yet the tariff question remains the chief issue between the two leading parties and a prominent issue with all the other parties. That it does retain this position of prominence there can be no doubt. It is so accepted and so treated by the great majority of the leaders and newspapers of both the old parties. President Cleveland's letter to Representative Catchings is to be the platform upon which the Democratic party (except the small protectionist wing) will ask popular indorsement at the coming elections. Both Mr. Reed's opening speech in Maine and Mr. Wilson's in West Virginia recognize and welcome the issue, and declare that the great tariff struggle, so far from being ended, is still at its height. True, the only immediate demand of the Democratic party as represented by Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Wilson, and their supporters, is for supplementary bills to correct what they deem the more glaring defects of the new tariff law ; and the only immediate purpose of the Republicans is to win control of the House of Representatives in order to prevent such amendatory legislation, but with no definite specification as to what the Republican party will do if it comes into full control of the government again in 1897. In reality, however, the issue is far broader and deeper than this immediate demand and purpose imply.

How, then, can the seeming paradox be explained ? The true

explanation undoubtedly is that while the question as to what rates of duty shall be levied upon imports has been settled for some years to come (except as to the comparatively few changes that may be made by supplementary bills), the fundamental difference between the Democratic and Republican parties as to the principle upon which tariff taxation should be based is still unsettled. It is not merely a difference of opinion as to what rates of duty should be levied at any particular time. It is a difference as to ultimate party policy. The difference is vital, and as long as it exists the tariff question is bound to remain one of the issues, if not the main issue, dividing the two parties. This vital issue, in its extreme form, is the issue between tariff for protection only and tariff for revenue only. In a modified form it becomes an issue between tariff for protection with incidental revenue, and tariff for revenue with incidental protection. The protection tenet in both forms is held by members of the Republican party, and the revenue tenet in both forms by members of the Democratic party, the extremists in the latter party being commonly called "free-traders." So also there are tariff-for-revenue-only Republicans, just as there are high-protectionist Democrats. But though the members of neither party are unanimous in support of any one policy, the dominating sentiment in the one party is for high protection, while in the other it is for a tariff for revenue only, ultimately if not immediately. The inherent antagonism between the two policies is apparent from the fact that a tariff is protective only in so far as it keeps out foreign products, while it is revenue-yielding only in so far as it admits foreign products; the modified application of the protective principle yielding incidental revenue, and the modified application of the revenue principle yielding incidental protection. To be more specific, a protective duty not made so high as to absolutely prohibit the importation of a given article, yields revenue to the extent that the article is imported in spite of the duty; while a revenue duty laid upon articles that are or can be produced at home yields a measure of protection, whether laid with a deliberate purpose to provide protection or not.

What policy will finally prevail—whether prohibitive duties will be laid, or whether all duties will be abolished (establishing actual free trade) and internal taxation be extended so as to provide all required government revenue, or whether “revenue only,” or “revenue with incidental protection,” or “protection with incidental revenue,” will at last establish itself upon the firm basis of human experience and enlightened self-interest—this is a question that the future must answer. Any attempt to answer it to-day is merely an expression of opinion as to what ought to be, viewing the matter in the light of the experience of the past, but without the test of the experience of the future. True, some policy must be adopted for the present, and that policy can be decided upon only in the light of the past; but when adopted it must remain always subject to modification or reversal as time shall test its truth and value, under changing economic conditions.

Every Democratic reverse at the polls during the past year and every assumed indication of Democratic defeat at the coming congressional elections has been accounted for by the extreme Republican organs, on the one hand, as an expression of popular disapproval of Democratic “tariff-tinkering” and an indication that the people of the country had changed their minds since they voted the Democratic party into power in 1892, chiefly on the tariff issue; while the Democratic organs, on the other hand, have been just as positive that these defeats and signs of future trouble for their party were mainly, if not wholly, due to Democratic delay and half-heartedness in fulfilling the party’s tariff-reform pledges.

And now the new law gives the party organs on both sides plenty of ground for keeping up the same line of reasoning and self-justification. Since the new law is not so drastic a measure as the Democratic party as a whole meant to enact, the party organs will argue in this wise: If under the new law the country passes from the present state of industrial depression into a fairly prosperous era, the Republican organs will maintain that it is because the Republicans and protectionist Democrats balked the fanatical tariff-reformers in their unholy zeal to

destroy the protective system, and that it is the saving grace of the protectionist Senate amendments to which the industrial recovery is to be credited; while the Democratic organs will maintain that if moderate reductions in duties have accomplished so much, a more vigorous onslaught on the policy of "mad protection" would have accomplished still more. On the other hand, should the economic recovery be less complete and satisfactory, the Republican organs will charge the partial failure to the partial carrying out of the Democratic program, and credit the partial recovery to the partial maintenance of Republican protection; while the Democratic organs will just as stoutly assert that it was protectionist interference with the Democratic tariff-reform program that prevented the return of full prosperity. And there you are.

Nor is this all. The advocates of the free coinage of silver, of state control of monopolies, of prohibition, and of various other plans for social and economic relief will continue to charge social and economic ills to the failure to adopt their particular remedies. Which, if any, of these diverse views is the correct one, or whether there is or is not an element of truth in them all, is the question that the individual voter must continue to face. What wonder if, in his confusion and his distrust of his own ability to solve the complex economic problem, he turn again to the party organ or the party leader and seek peace of mind and relief from personal responsibility by accepting the "I-say-it" of an authority that lays claim to political infallibility!

But this tendency to shirk personal responsibility, inquiry, investigation, and conclusion must be fought at every point. It must be iterated and reiterated that the only reasonable, justifiable, patriotic course, the course that holds out most promise of leading to a safe and certain conclusion, is to seek the truth through a careful study of the widely different views set forth in the newspapers and by the intellectual leaders of all parties and of no party, in the spirit of honest endeavor to discriminate between purely partisan appeal or groundless assertion and sincere, well-founded argument.

ERNEST E. RUSSELL.

HOW TO ABOLISH POVERTY.

BY FLORENCE A. BURLEIGH.

IN THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS for June is an article with the above title by Mrs. Ellen Battelle Dietrick, in answer to one by E. M. Burchard. There are several points in Mrs. Dietrick's answer which seem to call for criticism.

I agree most heartily with her that "the person who tells the truth" is a genuine friend to the poor; but I will go further and say that the truest friend to the poor is he or she who does all in his or her power to prevent poverty—not merely to "tell the truth" about it. Poverty does, indeed, show a diseased condition of society; but did Mrs. Dietrick ever seriously reflect as to the cause of this disease? I have endeavored to discover her diagnosis and cure, but can only guess at it. As near as I can tell, her cure seems to be gold currency and more economy among the poor.

However "unpleasant" it may be for a person to tell another "that his disease is the result of his own folly and the folly of his ancestors," it is still more "unpleasant" to allow him to go on in his diseased condition when he can be helped out of it. The society of to-day is so thoroughly diseased that only a "radical change" will restore it to health.

Mrs. Dietrick compares the poor to the primeval man in an African forest, where "the one way for any to rise higher than the others . . . was by the self-development of superior intelligence. . . . The industrious and intelligent saved, and the less able lived on their bounty." There is one immense difference between the two which utterly destroys the simile. The primitive men lived in a condition of freedom, while the poor of to-day live in a condition of slavery. It is right and just that an "industrious and intelligent" man should have more

than an indolent, ignorant one; otherwise we should be paying a premium on laziness and ignorance.

When society learns that what any one produces, whether by his muscle or his brain, that is his against the whole world, one great step in the right direction will have been taken. If he is provident and saving he will be the gainer thereby; if reckless and improvident he must suffer the consequences. But to-day the masses of the people get a bare living. The workers, who are the wealth producers, must live "from hand to mouth," and are thankful if they have ever so little in that hand to put into the mouth. "The power to save, the power to practice self-denial," is nowhere so rigidly exerted as among the poor. Whatever it may have been among the dwellers in the African forest, it is certainly true that among the dwellers in the large cities of our American republic the would-be "intelligent and industrious" workingmen are obliged to "live on the bounty" of the more fortunate, who, by our laws of special privilege, gather where they have not sown. It is undeniable that as a rule those who "get on in the world" do so, not because they "discount the present, hoping for enjoyable reward in the future," but because they are enabled by our tariff and land laws to appropriate what the workers produce.

"The mass of the poor . . . still worship a fetish which they believe to be all-powerful, and which they alternately cajole and upbraid, and whose name is 'Society,'" because they have an ill-defined idea that they are wronged in some way; that they do not receive what is justly their due; and that "Society" is to blame for such a condition. They are not alone in wanting "to eat their cake and yet still have it," for their more fortunate brothers not only want but have both, not, however, because they "saved cake," but because they robbed the baker.

The mass of the people are, indeed, unintelligent because they have neither time nor strength to be otherwise. The simile of the forest is a stronger one than Mrs. Dietrick intends. How is it that "beginning from the same soil some have learned how to use others for their own advancement," and what is the result? Some have used others by sucking their very life-blood, and the

result is death to the one so used. "The lesson we should learn from the rank, crowded forest, where a few live and many perish of overcrowding," is to stop the overcrowding. "Self-direction" is not possible where there is no room. "Man's choice of conditions is" *not* "practically unlimited as far as nature goes," because society has allowed nature's bounty to be so monopolized by a few that man has, as a rule, no choice.

If, instead of saying "wherever there is soil he can get a living," Mrs. Dietrick had said "wherever man has access to soil he can get a living," she would have struck the keynote. But, unfortunately, while to-day there is plenty of "soil," the access to it is cut off because of land monopoly. If that were destroyed man could "refuse to contribute his offspring to swell that wretched mass of cheap laborers in city slums" and "choose his own employer and his own place of abode." He has to-day no alternative but to sell his power of self-direction or starve. If land were free, so that any one who paid its value to society could use it, then we might talk of each man's ability to be his own employer.

The sin of "densely overcrowded places" is not to be laid at nature's door, but at man's. Trees and human beings both need "boundless room" in order to be symmetrical. Not only will "well-born trees grow straighter and stronger than the ill-born and sickly," but even "ill-born" trees stand a better chance of overcoming such disadvantages if they are allowed "to lift their heads into the nourishing air and sunlight" than if they are crowded and pressed upon and not allowed freedom. "The sensible thing" is to study out the cause of the overcrowding, not to experiment with various plasters and patent medicines.

If Mrs. Dietrick will study history she will find that wherever land is free there is an absence of "overcrowding," slums, and grinding poverty. Slums and palaces are coexistent with landlordism. "Who made the land of a country?" asks Carlisle in his "Past and Present." No man or woman. The quantity of land is neither more nor less than it was when the savages roamed in the primeval forests, "monarchs of all they surveyed." People cannot create land, but they can and do

create land value by their presence and their absolute need of land. Then why should not society take this value and use it to pay the expenses of the government which is made necessary by these same people? In this way each individual would then keep all he earns, instead of being taxed on nearly everything he uses, and society would also receive its own. Such a system as this is founded upon justice and equity.

One might have wished that Mrs. Dietrick had defined money. She evidently confuses "standard of value" with "money." We must have a standard of value or, as she says, "a fixed starting point in the business of exchange," but that is totally different from money, which is an invention to facilitate exchange by avoiding barter. For some reason 25.8 grains of gold ninety per cent pure has been made a standard of value and called a dollar by our American government. A definite quantity and quality of any other commodity that does not lose value by division would answer the purpose as well. But it does not follow that the commodity thus selected should be the material of the currency.

The very reason why Mrs. Dietrick objects to paper for currency is a good reason for using it. Paper is cheap and gold is dear; then why not use the cheaper commodity and leave the more valuable for the arts?

Mrs. Dietrick evidently confuses money with currency. The former includes all checks, drafts, and other private issues, as well as government money. Currency is what its name implies—that which passes current. I presume Mrs. Dietrick is aware that about ninety-five per cent of all the business of this country is done with private money, not gold or silver or paper currency. Therefore her paragraph in regard to the relative amounts of "money" used in the commerce of various countries is misleading, as she did not take into consideration that "the more enlightened and prosperous the nation" the larger the proportion of private money, not "the smaller their proportion of government money"; for under what head would checks and drafts come if not under that of money, if we grant the above definition?

Mrs. Dietrick hints at the way to abolish involuntary poverty—and we have no concern with voluntary poverty—when in her last sentence she says, “As long as his ideal of civilization remains that avowed by Mr. Burchard, that is, the elimination of the natural freedom of natural creatures, I do not see how any earthly plan can help him.” We can never have “natural freedom of natural creatures” until we allow men and women to get at the natural source of wealth, the land. Wealth is a product of labor (man) applied to land (all natural resources), and until we remove all restrictions which divorce these two we make it impossible for men to get all they earn. Poverty is caused by the separation of these two factors in the production of wealth. Given plenty of land and free access of man to it, any desired amount of wealth can be produced. Take away either and man will starve. To-day labor has not access to land because it is monopolized by the few; but make land free, allow any one to use it who pays its value to the community, and involuntary poverty will be impossible.

FLORENCE A. BURLEIGH.

MALTHUS AT THE HANDS OF RECENT CRITICS.

BY THOMAS NIXON CARVER, PH.D.

ANY doctrine which continually requires refutation during three quarters of a century may be regarded as resting on a tolerably sound basis. Few doctrines have been so favored in this respect as the Malthusian doctrine of population; few have been for so long a time a perennial subject for refutation. Though it has "rained refutations" during most of the time since the publication, in 1798, of the "Essay on the Principle of Population," yet to this day the opponents of the doctrine do not seem to be satisfied with the work of refutation as done by their predecessors, for we still hear occasionally of one who claims to have overthrown Malthus. A review of some of the objections that have been urged against this doctrine would doubtless be edifying. They range all the way from that optimistic credulity which tries to dispose of the whole troublesome matter by saying that Providence never creates mouths but it provides food for them, to the argument, based on statistics, that production has actually more than kept pace with population. But such a review cannot be undertaken here, because this paper is not a disquisition on the eccentricities of the human mind. There are, however, two writers who are so often quoted against Malthus that they deserve attention. These writers are Mr. Herbert Spencer and Mr. Henry George.

The writer does not wish to be understood to classify Herbert Spencer among the opponents of Malthus. He is often spoken of as such, but the reason for it is not clear. It is doubtful if anything was farther from his mind than the idea that he was refuting Malthus when he wrote his "Laws of Multiplication" ("Principles of Biology," Vol. II., N. Y., 1872). The following passage indicates that he accepted the essential features of the doctrines of Malthus:

And, manifestly, this excess of demand over supply is perennial; this pressure of population, of which it is the index, cannot be eluded. Though by the emigration that takes place when the pressure arrives at a certain intensity, temporary relief is from time to time obtained, yet, as by this process all habitable countries must become peopled, it follows that in the end the pressure, whatever it may then be, must be borne in full. This constant increase of people beyond the means of subsistence causes, then, a never ceasing requirement for skill, intelligence, and self-control—involves, therefore, a constant exercise of these and a gradual growth of them.—(*"Principles of Biology,"* Vol. II., p. 498.)

What Mr. Spencer really attempts is to make an addition to the already well-established doctrine of population by showing that the physical capacity for increase in population diminishes with an increase in civilization, so that positive checks on population become less and less operative, and preventive checks less and less necessary. But this result can only be brought about by a continuation of the forces which Malthus so forcibly pointed out. The tendency to overpopulation, with its continually intensifying competition, which is but the economic term for "struggle for existence," "is in itself a cause of man's further evolution," and man's further evolution "itself necessitates a decline in his fertility."

It would seem that the final outcome of this "antagonism between individuation and genesis" will be such a decline in man's fertility as to bring about an equilibrium between population and subsistence without the intervention of even rational checks. But it is evident that this result can only follow a long and wasteful struggle between man and his environment. It is only that fierce struggle for existence which results from the tendency to overpopulation that can produce that excessive individuation which would reduce man's procreative capacity to the limits which Mr. Spencer has set for it.

If, however, Mr. Spencer may be assumed to have proven his point, it would be a real and significant addition to the theory of population. It would mean that there were at least two forces, instead of one, at work hastening the possibility of social perfectibility. Malthus had pointed out that all dreams of social elysiums were baseless until men should learn to practice that

virtuous self-restraint which would keep down population without the intervention of vice, misery, war, or famine. But Mr. Spencer's doctrine of the decline of generative power with an increase in civilization works in harmony with it to hasten the possibility of a social millennium.

While Mr. Spencer apparently had no idea of refuting Malthus, Mr. Henry George leaves no doubt in the mind of the reader that he repudiates the whole doctrine, and believes that he has most effectually overthrown it. He joins issue directly with the following passage from John Stuart Mill, which may be taken as an excellent summary of the Malthusian doctrine :

A greater number of people cannot, in any given state of civilization, be collectively so well provided for as a smaller. The niggardliness of nature, not the injustice of society, is the cause of the penalty attached to overpopulation. An unjust distribution of wealth does not aggravate the evil, but, at most, causes it to be somewhat earlier felt. It is in vain to say that all mouths which the increase of mankind calls into existence bring with them hands. The new mouths require as much food as the old ones, and the hands do not produce as much. If all instruments of production were held in joint property by the whole people, and the produce divided with perfect equality among them, and if in a society thus constituted industry were as energetic and produce as ample as at the present time, there would be enough to make all the existing population extremely comfortable ; but when that population had doubled itself, as, with the existing habits of the people under such encouragement, it undoubtedly would in a little more twenty years, what would then be their condition ? Unless the art of production were in the same time improved in an almost unexampled degree, the inferior soils which must be resorted to and the more laborious and scantily remunerative cultivation which must be employed on the superior soils, to procure food for so much larger a population, would, by an insuperable necessity, render every individual in the community poorer than before. If the population continued to increase at the same rate, a time would soon arrive when no one would have more than the mere necessities, and soon after a time when no one would have a sufficiency of those, and the further increase of population would be arrested by death.—(*Principles of Political Economy*," Book I., Ch. 13, Sec. 2.)

To this Mr. George replies as follows :

All this I deny. I assert that the very reverse of these propositions is true. I assert that in any given state of civilization, a greater number of people can collectively be better provided for than a smaller. I assert that the injustice of society, and not the niggardliness of nature, is the cause of want and misery which the current theory

attributes to overpopulation. I assert that the new mouths which an increasing population calls into existence require no more food than the old ones, while the hands they bring with them can, in the natural order of things, produce more. I assert that, other things being equal, the greater the population the greater the comfort which an equitable distribution of wealth would give to each individual. I assert that in a state of equality, the natural increase of population would constantly tend to make every individual richer instead of poorer.—("Progress and Poverty," Book II., Chapter 4.)

Mr. George brings to the support of his position a series of arguments remarkable alike for their lack of conclusiveness and for their unlooked-for consequences. First, he argues from "facts," and having selected a number of territories which have increased in population, he asks, pertinently, if they have not increased even more rapidly in wealth. He also asks if it is not true that under similar circumstances—that is to say, among communities of similar people, in a similar stage of civilization—the most densely populated community is the richest. These questions are asked in a manner that leaves no doubt that the author believed that they could be answered only in the affirmative, and that an affirmative answer to these questions necessarily involved an utter giving up of the last vestige of belief in Malthusianism. But the Malthusian may consistently answer these questions in the affirmative and still retain his faith; he may even beat Mr. George in the argument, adopting Mr. George's own premises; for as it appears to him, Mr. George has simply hitched the cart before the horse. It is an essential part of Malthusianism that population is limited by the means of subsistence; consequently, as wealth and means of subsistence increase, population may and will increase likewise. Therefore, in strict conformity with this doctrine it must always be that, under similar conditions, the richest country will be the most populous; it will support a larger population. The Malthusian not only admits but asserts that a greater number of people will live in a rich than a poor country, and that the most populous countries are therefore the richest.

It is not quite fair to compare, as Mr. George does, a newly settled with an old and thickly populated country. In the first place, the vast accumulations of capital invested in productive

forms greatly augment the productive power of the latter country. In the second place, it is quite true that, up to a certain point, an increase in the density of population, by enlarging the opportunities for division of labor, may increase the productiveness of the individual laborer. But so soon as that point is reached where two or more laborers must be engaged in precisely the same processes or remain unemployed, the point is passed at which an increase of population will increase the productiveness of each additional laborer. At this point begins the diminution of the returns of labor. At this point rent will begin to be paid for land, and, as will be shown later, where rent is paid we have a positive proof that the point where diminishing returns begins has been passed. Rent emerges as a result of a competition for the most favorable situations. This means that the later comers must make use of poorer situations and work under less advantageous circumstances than their predecessors.

Probably the whole range of literature does not contain a stranger piece of argument than the following attempt to cover the Malthusian with confusion :

The web of generations is like lattice work or the diagonal threads in cloth. Commencing at any point at the top, the eye follows lines which at the bottom widely diverge ; but beginning at the bottom, the lines diverge in the same way to the top. How many children a man may have is problematical, but that he had two parents is certain and that each of these again had two parents is also certain. Follow this geometrical progression through a few generations, and see if it does not lead to quite as "striking consequences" as Mr. Malthus' peopling of the solar systems.—("Progress and Poverty," Book II., Chapter 2.)

Now this is doubtless very severe on the followers of Malthus, and may possibly appeal strongly to some of Mr. George's readers. But it scarcely amounts to a demonstration until it be shown that two parents uniformly give life to but one offspring. But if that were true and had always been true, Mr. George would quite probably never have had the Malthusian doctrine to refute ; and this for several reasons. First, there would never have been any Malthus to write on population ; second, there would never have been any population to write about ;

third, there would never have been any Mr. George to write about Mr. Malthus. The story of man on earth must, for obvious reasons, have closed with the issue of the first pair. If, however, we could assume the earth to have been thickly populated to begin with, it could have been only a matter of a few generations until the race of men must have become extinct. But it is the way that parents have of begetting more than their own number of offspring that plays the mischief with Mr. George's argument and forms the *raison d'être* of the doctrine of population. This fact obviates the "striking consequences" of Mr. George's illustration. So palpable is the absurdity of the illustration as an argument against Malthus that it is difficult to avoid being prejudiced against the other arguments used by the same author. Whether Malthus were right or not, he at least was not guilty of using so ridiculous an argument as the one quoted from Mr. George.

One of the "striking consequences" of Mr. George's position, and one which he seems not fully to have appreciated, is the essential contradiction between his refutation of Malthus and his theory of the unearned increment. The whole theory of rent rests on the principle of the diminishing returns from the cultivation of land. If it be true, as he asserts, that the productivity of successive increments of labor does not diminish, but increases indefinitely, it is difficult to see how there could be such a thing as rent and an unearned increment. He seems to have partially recognized this difficulty in the following language :

As conclusively proving the law of diminishing productiveness it is said in the current treatises that were it not true that beyond a certain point land yields less and less to additional applications of labor and capital, increasing population would not cause any extension of cultivation ; but that all the increased supplies needed could and would be raised without taking into cultivation any fresh ground.—("Progress and Poverty," Book II., Ch. 3, p. 118.)

Now to every economist this would seem to be a serious difficulty, and one that ought to be thoroughly and fairly disposed of before Mr. George claims to have established his position. But those radical writers who attempt to brush aside the established opinions and principles of the science of economics (or of

any science for that matter) with the high-handed freedom of a cavalier, enjoy the peculiar privilege of being unrestrained by such conventionalities as logic and consistency. Mr. George is able to rid (?) himself of the difficulty by a metaphysical disquisition on the conservation of energy. He argues, from the fact that man physically considered is but a "transient form of matter, a changing mode of motion," that there can never be such a thing as overpopulation, at least not till standing room on the face of the earth becomes scarce. "Speaking absolutely," says he, "man neither produces nor consumes. The whole human race, were they to labor to infinity, could not make this rolling sphere one atom heavier or one atom lighter, could not add to or diminish by one iota the sum of the forces whose everlasting circling produces all motion and sustains all life. As the waters we take from the ocean must return to the ocean, so the food we take from the reservoirs of nature is, from the moment we take it, on its way back to those reservoirs."

Now this is only an artful evasion of the real question, and an attempt to play the cuttle-fish—or rather an attempt to blind the reader to the real question by a pyrotechnic display of glittering metaphysical generalizations. There is a certain majestic sweep of the imagination, together with an exquisite power of diction, in his argument, so that the reader scarcely has the courage to hold the author strictly to the consideration of some of the disagreeable facts which we, as finite creatures, are forced to face. But there are certain serious objections to this form of argument. In the first place it is not explained how the fact that "speaking absolutely" man neither produces nor consumes obviates the difficulty of providing food when we speak relatively to the industrial achievements and appliances of the present. We cannot settle the question of population by "speaking absolutely." For all practical purposes, man both produces and consumes, and the question of numbers is to be considered from the standpoint of his ability to produce as much as he consumes. If mankind had acquired the art of instantaneously and easily extracting from earth and sea and sky the chemical elements which support life, it would be interesting to discuss the

possibilities of population from the standpoint of the conservation of energy. But so long as the present slow and difficult processes must be resorted to in order to extract food from the reservoirs of nature, such a discussion could have no practical importance.

In the second place, even were Mr. George able to sustain the argument that the productiveness of labor continually increases with the increase of numbers, he would still not be free from the other horn of the dilemma. Were it true that a greater number of laborers could, in the natural order of things, produce more per man than a smaller number, it would seem that the average farmer makes a great mistake in not covering his estate with laborers. An increase of laborers necessitates one of two things: either new and poorer land must be taken into cultivation, or a greater number of laborers must be concentrated upon the land already under cultivation. Now it will be difficult to convince the average man that a given amount of labor will produce more when applied to poor land than to good land. But unless this be assumed, Mr. George's position must be that the more laborers engaged on any given piece of land the greater the productivity of each laborer. Now if this be true, it would follow that a farmer could better afford to employ ten men than five upon his farm, and twenty than ten, and so on indefinitely. And what would be true of a farm would also be true of any manufacturing plant, or of a whole community.

There are two facts which are almost universally admitted and which lead almost inevitably to the Malthusian doctrine. First, the fact of the diminishing returns of labor; second, the fact that marriage and birth-rates almost invariably increase in times of prosperity and decrease in times of depression. It is not the purpose of this paper to undertake to establish positively the Malthusian doctrine, but only to examine the validity of some of the criticisms that have been passed upon it. The former has been well done before; the latter, it is hoped, is now sufficiently well done.

T. N. CARVER.

"ARE OUR PATENT LAWS INIQUITOUS?" A REPLY.

BY PROF. H. OLERICH.

ARE our patent laws iniquitous? is a question of great magnitude to the people of the United States; for these laws are one of the factors which determine our comfort, our material prosperity, and our mental achievements. The Honorable Simonds, ex-commissioner of patents, in an article in *The North American Review* for December last, ably, and no doubt honestly, defends them. He appears to think that, as a whole, the patent laws are not only *expedient* but *right* also. The writer of this article will present the opposite side.

Whatever may be urged in favor of expediency on the side of our patent laws, we will attempt to show that they are not grounded on the law of equal freedom, and are, therefore, as a whole, iniquitous. Let us now analyze Mr. Simonds' argument.

He says: "The inventor holds his property by two distinct and impregnable titles. It is his because of his natural right to it, and also because the public welfare—formulating its need and will in the Constitution and statutes—demands that it shall be his." The first title, if rightly interpreted, we think is a valid one; for the reason that every person is justly entitled to the full products of his labor, whether physical or mental. The validity of the second depends on the fact whether the Constitution here rests on justice. The very amendments to the Constitution stand as indictments and shortcomings to the original document. In other words, they are evidence that the constitutions of progressive people need constant revision, because a constitution that is adapted to the best needs of the people in one age is not so in a subsequent age. Thus the second title rests on the correctness of the Constitution. We can no more measure justice by the Constitution than by the Koran, before we know that they are the embodiments of justice.

Mr. Simonds says: "Let us pause to understand what the possession of the invention means. The invention is a visible expression of a mental conception; its value does not reside in the intrinsic worth of the wood, or iron, or brass by the use of which the mental conception is made manifest; it resides in the visible expression of the mental conception itself." Now, if an invention is the visible expression of a mental conception, does this mental conception at the expiration of the patent lapse into nothing? Does it not follow that if an invention is the visible expression of a mental conception, and if an inventor is entitled to a patent on that conception, that conception must either lapse into nothing at the close of seventeen years, or the inventor is aggrieved by the expiration of the patent? If the inventor is entitled to the exclusive ownership and control of his mental conception at the end of seventeen years, why not at the end of twenty years? Why not during the whole period of his life? And, further, if it is his rightful property during his life, why, under the present order of things, would he not have a just right to bequeath it? In support of this let me cite from Mr. Herbert Spencer's *Justice*, Part IV., of "Ethics," p. 108, where he says that in England "in 1774 it was decided that common law gives the author and his assigns sole right of publication in perpetuity." If this holds good of copyright why not of patents? If it was right in England in 1774, why is it not right in the United States in 1894?

Says Mr. Simonds further: "The inventor does not deprive his fellow-man of any right he had before. His invention, in order to be an invention, must be something new." This is very true of an invention if no patent is granted him; but we think it is not true of him if a patent is granted to him, no matter if the duration of the patent is but for one month, or in perpetuity. Let us see.

Has not every child that comes into the world a just birth-right to all the possibilities, all the genius, all the advantages and achievements, of the historic age in which it is born and in which it lives? Is not a patent an infringement on this sacred, equal birthright, for the reason that the new-comer is prohibited

from availing himself of the best thoughts and possibilities of his times? One may thus possibly come into a world where he cannot, during all his life, avail himself of any useful mechanical appliance, further than he can buy or otherwise obtain the patentee's *permission* to use it; for Congress has the power to name any *limited* time for the duration of a patent, from one moment to more than a thousand years. May he not thus be deprived of all the best contemporaneous knowledge of his times? Is he, under these conditions, a free, equal competitor with his contemporaries? Few, if any, we think, will concede that he is. But the patent laws inflict a still deeper wrong and disadvantage on all who come into the world having patented inventions.

It is a universally admitted fact that all new and superior inventions, new thoughts, and new forms of government awaken correspondingly new wants and new desires. Thus the new-comer, with his many new wants, is thrown into a world where he has no legal right to satisfy these new wants and desires with the help of the patented inventions which awakened and developed them, unless he purchases or otherwise obtains permission from the patentees who have an exclusive control over the manufacture and sale of them. So much for the deprivation of equal opportunities of the new-comer, whether unborn, native-born, or immigrant. Now let us briefly turn our attention to the inventor's contemporaries and co-laborers.

To illustrate a general principle: Suppose that A, B, C, and many others have been working for some ten or twelve years to invent a successful corn-husker. These inventors all live in different localities. Neither of them knows that the others are working at the same invention. Their experience and experimental tests, however, slowly lead them all to the same general conception of a successful corn-husker. A completes his invention and takes out a patent on it. B soon after hears of A's husker and patent. B worked at his invention for twelve years, and requires only a few days more to complete it; but A's patent bars him out, he is obliged to quit. After spending so much time, thought, and money, B is not even allowed to become A's competitor in the sale of his own invention. C

does not hear of A's patent immediately, he diligently pursues his work for some time, until he completes a husker on the same principles and fully as meritorious as A's. Immediately after the completion he makes arrangements for taking out a patent. He is informed by the patent office that A took out a patent on a similar husker some weeks ago. Thus A's patent deprives C of all remunerative opportunities. C, after all his work and expense, is not allowed even to manufacture and sell his own invention for seventeen years to come. But this is not the only injury worked by A's patent. All who desire to purchase huskers are thereby deprived of the privilege of buying in a market in which the price is harmoniously adjusted by free competition, because B, C, and all others are forced out of the market, and, if these purchasers are thus disadvantaged by A's monopolistic privileges, then all who buy the *products* of these disadvantaged purchasers must also be disadvantaged. For he who is forced to buy a machine in a bloated market must in turn, in order that he may continue his business, sell the products of that machine in an inflated market. Thus, by the granting of a patent, every inhabitant in the land is either directly or indirectly deprived of some sacred privileges. Perhaps few who have looked at the question impartially will claim that such is *right* or *equitable*; but they usually justify the commission of such wrongs on the ground that without the granting of patents no one would desire to invent. Let us look at this question candidly.

Mr. Simonds asks, "Has [the granting of patents] promoted the progress of science and useful arts?" This is, of course, the very question at issue. Mr. Simonds enumerates a long list of American inventors and their inventions; but his argument throughout is based on the tacit, and we believe unwarrantable, assumption that these useful inventions are the direct or indirect products of the patent laws; that we would not have them if no patents were granted to inventors. As an expositor of the patent laws, the burden of proof rests with Mr. Simonds; but he does not even attempt an explanation or give a suggestion why we would not have them without the patent laws. That

these inventions, *if rightly used*, are of immense advantage to humanity no well-informed person will deny, and the very fact that they are so useful and pleasing to the growing intelligence and refinement of man is almost conclusive evidence that Mr. Simonds' tacit assumption is fallacious. That not only man, but all sentient beings have indefatigably been seeking for the advantageous is, in my opinion, the strongest proof that *under equal freedom*, that is, without the patent laws and other similar monopolistic laws, we would not only have our present inventions but many more. That the patent laws and other similar laws granting special privileges tend to produce rapid concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, will, we think, be admitted by most if not by all who have given such sociological questions a thorough and impartial consideration; and this rapid concentration of wealth in the hands of the few necessarily produces a corresponding depletion of wealth in the hands of the *many*, for a financial advantage can only consist in getting directly or indirectly some material wealth at the *expense of others*. In the case cited above, A's special privilege enables him to grow wealthy at the expense of B and C, as well as all others who buy his invention or the products of the invention.

According to the well-established theory of evolution by such brilliant and authoritative lights as Spencer, Darwin, Huxley, Wallace, and an army of others, there has been in the animal kingdom as well as elsewhere a slow but gradual development from the simple to the complex, from the low to the high. By this long continued process of physical and mental growth, beneficial acts have, as a whole, become pleasurable. The ever present benefits derived from useful inventions and discoveries have unfolded the inventive genius and the spirit of inquiry in man both as an individual and as a race, to such an extent that every person now seeks to gratify this inborn sentiment to the fullest extent in his power, because it gives him pleasure to do so. The higher the being the more rapid the progress and the keener the delight and satisfaction which crowns success in every accomplishment. Every laborer, in order that he may be able to do his work with less toil and receive greater approba-

tion from his fellow-men, is always consciously, or unconsciously, trying to invent something new, improve the old, and discover something hitherto unknown; for success in these fields is always associated with satisfaction, advantages, comfort, honor, dignity, and respectability. Through all the long geologic, prehistoric, and historic ages of the past, these compensations springing from success have always been the true and successful incentives which have led the whole animal creation to aim and strive for greater achievements. Why these incentives should now all be inoperative and dead in man, without the patent law, Mr. Simonds does not tell us. It is, however, a serious, and in my opinion an unwarrantable, indictment against the nobler characteristics of man. It sets man down as a mere *miser*, seeking his own destruction rather than his own *advancement*.

That gold is *one* of the most powerful stimuli that impel man to strive, invent, and discover, every thoughtful observer well knows, but it is by no means the *only* one. Gold, as a rule, furnishes the material subsistence—the need of the physical organism; but man does not live by bread alone. A vigorous mind feels the need of mental food as keenly as the body feels the need of material food. Both incessantly strive to satisfy their wants. How true this is may be seen anywhere in the animal kingdom. The little dog which is fed all he wants to eat finds, nevertheless, pleasure in outdoing his playmates in actual work or sportive play. The little child which has never felt the want of material subsistence feels proud of being unable to outrun its father, to lift a heavier weight, in a pretended game of contest. Emulation stirs the schoolboy to his utmost activity. The power to excel, and the gratification resulting from healthful exercise, keep alive the keen interest in all games of sport. It was not gold which stimulated the contestants in the Grecian “games.” A mere garland of olive was awarded to the victor, which gave him a deathless fame. The soldier faces death for the love of his country. The delightful approval resulting from agreeable personal appearance, such as cleanliness and adornment, are not kept up and unfolded for the gold value they contain. So with music, art, science, thought, inventions, improvements, and

discoveries ; below the gold surface there lies a deeper and more perfect sentiment which does not depend for its stimulus and vitality on a patent law. Thus we see that if every vestige of material remuneration could be removed, men would still continue to construct, invent, and improve for the same reasons that they now continue their games, sportive exercises, etc. ; but even without the patent law this material remuneration would still exist. This we shall now consider.

Under free competition, where tools and machinery are manufactured and operated for the interest of all—which would be the case under free competition—the invention and use of every useful tool and labor-saving machine would be a blessing, would shorten the total average day's labor, and otherwise add to the comforts and enjoyments of man. But with the patent law and other similar monopolistic privileges in operation such may not be the case. After clogging up natural opportunities by granting special privileges to some, which work a corresponding disadvantage to others, it may easily become possible that the invention and operation of a great labor-saving machine, which is operated in the interest of a privileged individual or corporation, becomes a detriment to a people rather than a blessing. Such has to a great extent always been the fear of the masses. That they were not wholly wrong in their vague ideas may be seen from the fact that now millions of industrious men and women are out of employment and on the verge of destitution, and the monopolization of patented inventions is one of the principal factors which produced these deplorable conditions. It cannot be due to the quantity and quality of our natural resources, for they are practically inexhaustible and unlimited in supply and extent. The hand of labor could rapidly touch them into useful forms, if it was only permitted to do so. The want of employment and destitution of the unemployed cannot be due to a scarcity of tools, machinery, and factories, for the people of the United States have more of them than they are operating. What is the cause of it then ? The patent law is one of the causes, as we have seen in the case cited where A's patent prevents B and C, as well as many others, from manufacturing

corn-huskers which could be operated in the cornfield, if land and other natural opportunities were not unjustly held out of use.

If there were no labor-saving machines and no improved tools, the average home would not contain many of the articles of comfort and luxury which we now find there. The rich man's mansion would then be no comparison to his present one; but from an historic as well as philosophic view, we also have strong reasons to believe that, without the modern inventions, there would be no army of industrious unemployed, few if any densely crowded tenements, etc. Without the modern inventions our average American home would no doubt be more simple, less comfortable, and less cheerful; but we have strong reasons to believe that there would be few if any *industrious* people *entirely homeless*. If this is true nearly every person would then at least have a *humble* home, which is, no doubt, much better than to have no home at all. But why should we be satisfied with humble homes for all? If without the modern inventions nearly all of us could have at least a *humble* home, why should not, then, all industrious persons at least, *with* the advantages of modern inventions, have *splendid* homes? The inventions themselves have not produced this mischief. Useful inventions, as we have already stated, are in themselves *always* beneficial to mankind, if they are operated under free competition. What we need most, then, in the near future is not so much new inventions, not so much new improved tools, not so much new and more factories, but a more just and equitable social and economic adjustment, so that those who are now out of employment may be called upon by the spirit of the times to operate those useful inventions and tools which are now idle. Our principal aim should be to bring together the industrious person and the unused invention, and the patent law is one of the factors which has alienated them. The cause of our present widespread suffering is not so much due to an underproduction of wealth as it is to a pernicious distribution of it.

Mr. Simonds says the builders of the Constitution, by granting patents to inventors, "were seeking to benefit the *public*, not to

reward the *inventor*." That the builders of the Constitution were seeking to benefit the public by granting patents to inventors, we think is very true. The writer has at least no desire to question the honesty of the framers of the Constitution on this point; but have they found what they were seeking for, is a question of much more vital importance to us than the question of their honesty. The contemporaries of the Inquisition were, no doubt, honest in what they were seeking for; the framers of the Constitution who sanctioned slavery were undoubtedly honest, but were they right, is what vitally concerns us. Honesty, running in the wrong direction, does not add to the comforts and progress of the world. It cannot make a wrong right.

Now let us briefly consider as far as possible whether, in the broadest sense, the granting of patents did actually benefit the public or the inventor, or either of them. We have seen that the patent laws and other similar laws are an impediment to free competition; that any obstruction to free competition causes a rapid concentration of wealth in the hands of the few and a corresponding reduction to the *many*. That nearly all inventors are from the *many* class, will, we think, be disputed by but few, if any. The reason for this is that the *very* poor are financially unable to invent; and, as a rule, a rich man who accumulates his own fortune must be naturally so constituted that he finds pleasure in making everything else secondary to the getting of dollars and cents. If he is not largely so constituted he is not likely to become rich, and if he is so constituted he is not likely to become an inventor. The fact that a large portion of the wealthy have never learned to perform any manual labor and that they look down upon it as degrading, is another reason why, as a rule, inventors do not come from their class. To invent presupposes time, industry, inclination, and wealth.

If no inhabitant of the United States had more than a dollar's worth of property, few if any important inventions could be produced. We would all then have to work early and late to keep the fierce wolf of want away from our door, no matter how strongly the inventive genius might prompt us to act in the

direction of inventing. Thus the pernicious effect of the patent laws and other similar laws, which produced the army of unemployed, makes it impossible for them to gratify their natural inclination for invention. A person that has not even a quarter with which to buy the next meal cannot be an inventor. Poverty, also, greatly reduces the favorable opportunity in that other large class of laborers who have employment only part of the time; and, lastly, these laws make it more difficult for any one who is, even in the slightest degree, either directly or indirectly deprived of a part of his just earnings. This poverty resulting from these iniquitous special privileges no doubt vastly reduces the number of possible inventors and inventions. No doubt a countless number of ideas and thoughts which are thus born in comparative poverty can never find expression in an invention which would otherwise perhaps be of incalculable value to ourselves and our posterity. These intricate and detrimental results, flowing out of the granting of patents, were likely not foreseen by the framers of the Constitution, for at that early period sociological inquiry was in its very infancy. Our forefathers thought that they would offer the direct inducement to the inventor, and that this inducement would stimulate the inventor to invent, and that the public or masses would thus be benefited by numerous inventions. Thus they tried to bestow benefits on the public by way of *privileged individuals and corporations*. But it is found by actual trial that this circuitous route is a poor conductor; nearly all the financial benefits leak off from the circuit at the station of the privileged individuals and corporations who hold the interests of the patents. The masses, as a rule, are only injured by the obstruction of the useless portion of the circuit. It tends to impoverish the masses, and therefore diminishes the number of inventions, for no very poor man can be an inventor. On the other hand, if there were no granting of special privileges to operate as impediments in the production and distribution of wealth, in which case every industrious person could be moderately affluent, all would have a favorable opportunity to gratify their strong natural tendencies for inventing, discovering, and improving. That a number of our present inventors have to a certain extent been stimulated by the patent laws, we do not deny. We claim, however, that for every *one* they have stimulated to become an inventor who

would under other favorable circumstances not have become an inventor, a large number of *others* have been partially or wholly impoverished by them, so that their thoughts, their ideas, and their inventive genius died with them in poverty and obscurity.

Mr. Simonds seems to think that without the patent law there would be no remunerative inducement for inventors to invent. This, we think, is far from the truth. Without the patent law, the inventor would still have the *first* and *best* opportunity to manufacture and sell his own invention at a fair price. Says some one, "If the patentee had no patent on his invention some rich individual or corporation would engage in manufacturing the invention and crowd out the poor patentee by underselling." But right here is the secret. If no patent laws and other monopolistic privileges were granted to certain classes to the detriment of others, there could be no such rich individuals or corporations. All that have accumulated immense fortunes have done so by the aid of some special privilege granted to them by *law*. Without the granting of special privileges there could be no millionaires, nor need there be any poor persons. Every person would have to *earn* his wealth by his own labor, and all would find an abundant opportunity to labor at all times and keep all he actually produces; under such conditions no one would have an advantage over a patentee. If he sells his production at reasonable prices, on its own merit, in an unobstructed market, no one else would care to compete with him, unless the increasing demand would raise the price to such an extent that others would be attracted by it; and such free competition is the only conceivable economic force that can furnish the public with the cheapest and best articles. Hence, the inventor, besides enjoying the honor and approbation of his fellow-men for his inventive genius and industry, for being a benefactor to the race, would further receive the preference of every intelligent purchaser, the same as our warmest friends, other things being equal, always receive the preference over strangers in any deal. That this is a fact we see all around us in our daily life.

There is one other grave objection against the granting of patents. It discourages improvements on patented inventions. The reason is this: Any one besides the original inventor who makes an improvement on the original invention, cannot use this improvement without the original invention of which it

may become a part. It is true that the improver can take out a patent on his improvement ; but what good is the improvement to him unless he can sell it to the original inventor, or unless he can purchase the right of the original inventor to manufacture and sell the original invention with his improvement on it? The original inventor can contrive to manufacture and sell his invention without the improvement. He need not be very anxious for improvements, since he has no competitors. The improvements cannot be sold alone and there is only one person in the world who can make use of it, and this person is the original inventor who owns the patent. The improver is thus at a great disadvantage and can be starved into most any kind of a bargain by the inventor. This discourages improvement and is very injurious to the public.

Says Mr. Simonds, "Take away the inventor's inducement to invent, and you kill the goose that lays the golden egg." We no doubt all admit that if *all* the inducements for invention were taken away, a person would no more invent than a person would eat if all inducements for eating were taken away. We contend, however, that the aggregate inducement for inventing would be immensely augmented in a free, prosperous world in which no patent rights and other similar monopolistic privileges are granted.

"And if it were true that inventors invent as birds sing," remarks Mr. Simonds, "the objector's difficulty would be only half overcome. The patent laws are necessary in order to induce capital to take the risks of commercially developing inventions."

When we think for a moment that enterprises, such as rail-roading and countless others, involving the outlay of millions of dollars, are carried on in every section of the country without the protection of patent laws, we would soon come to the conclusion that the American people are not afraid to invest in a productive enterprise of useful invention, and their shrewdness, foresight, and intelligence are amply sufficient to tell which inventions are useful and which are not. No criterion, such as a patent law, is necessary for this. Thus it seems that from whatever standpoint we may approach or contemplate the subject of patent laws, we are sooner or later forced to the conclusion that for *every* possible *pearl* the public may *gain* from the operation of the patent laws, it certainly *loses* a *number* of brilliant *gems*.

THE OUTLOOK.

A department devoted to notes and comments concerning affairs of interest to intelligent and patriotic citizens. Communications relating to local and other efforts for the improvement of governmental and social conditions, on the part of individuals or Municipal Reform, Good Government, Law and Order, and similar organizations, including ethical and religious efforts for the promotion of good citizenship, are especially invited. Address Outlook Department, American Journal of Politics, 38 Park Row, New York.

THE RIGHTS OF STRIKERS.—Justice Harlan of the Supreme Court has recently rendered a decision involving the right of railway employees to strike, in which he materially differs from the view of Judge Jenkins, uttered last winter, which resulted in the restraining of the employees of the Northern Pacific Railroad from "continuing and conspiring to quit the service of the road." Justice Harlan differs from this sentiment and holds that "it would be an invasion of one's natural liberty to compel him to work for or remain in the personal service of another, and one who is placed in such restraint is in a condition of involuntary servitude." Justice Harlan, however, sustains so much of Judge Jenkins' decision and order as forbade strikers from conspiring to injure the property or business of the railroad by force and violence. Employees may quit work either singly or by concerted action, but they may not use force or violence or intimidation against their late employers or against others who propose to work in the striker's stead.

POPULAR EDUCATION IN CIVICS.—Some statements were presented in our last issue as to the "Extension Department" of the A. I. C. Mr. H. D. Slater, manager of *Public Opinion*, devotes a page of the October 11th number of that valuable journal to a statement of the aims of this department, of which he is the responsible director. Under the head of "Club Notes" he announces that the next issue of *Public Opinion* will contain an article by Henry Randall Waite on the *raison d'être* of the department. A letter is also presented from Dr. R. H. Holbrook, of the National Normal University, Lebanon, O., president of the department club (No. 20) in that city, who says: "We shall count our membership by the hundreds before the end of the year." It is further announced that a twenty-page book, containing a statement of the aims of the Extension Department, with plans for the organization and conduct of clubs, will be sent to any address upon receipt of ten cents. Address Extension Department A. I. C., P. O. Box 348, Washington, D. C.

"REGULARITY" IN PARTY POLITICS.—When the vouchers of party membership and the control of partisan political machinery in the great cities of the republic are found in the hands of skilfully organized bandits, who peacefully extort and systematically divide for the benefit of all concerned tribute levied on merchants, shipowners, street peddlers, and apple women; and not content with this democratic application of the demand, "Stand and deliver," encourage and protect gamblers and thieves and women in the sale of their virtue, in consideration of a share in the price of their infamy; the irregularity of independent voting ought to commend itself to every self-respecting, intelligent, and patriotic citizen as a paramount duty, just in proportion to the obvious shamefulness of any further slavish subserviency to "regularity" in partisanship. This plain truth is worthy the consideration of other than the citizens who are now asked, as a matter of regularity, to make themselves participants in the crime of debauching government in the city and state of New York. In San Francisco, Chicago, St. Louis, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Boston, and hundreds of other cities and smaller towns, hide-bound devotion to party must give way in order to the restoration of honesty and decency in local government. We have faith to believe that the hour for the union of good citizens for the restoration of municipal good government, will soon strike in all of our great cities.

BEACON LIGHTS OF PATRIOTISM.—Under this title, General Henry B. Carrington, LL.D., U. S. A., one of the most interested of the officers of the A. I. C. and a trustee from its establishment, has edited, and Silver, Burdette & Co. have published (one volume, octavo, 442 pp.), a book which possesses rare value and interest. As stated by its distinguished editor, it is the outcome of "a sincere desire to contribute toward a higher grade of thought and sentiment among the youth of America," and embodies "the incentives to virtue and good citizenship which have had expression in prose and verse throughout human experience." The book is in fact an epitome of the best of the utterances of all times and peoples which have breathed the spirit of "intelligent liberty and right obligation." It is emphatically a book for American citizens, and of such there are none who would not be profited by having this compact and inexpensive library of the literature of patriotism within hand reach. The Institute of Civics will send the volume to any address, postpaid, upon receipt of one dollar.

THE ANTIQUITY OF CORRUPTION.—Corruption is of no particular time. There was a period in Christian Europe in which kings were for sale, as legislative bodies are now—witness England under Charles II. Our age is no more corrupt than former ages—only the ulcer has spread and grown; for with universal suffrage the branches of the tree of power have been brought within reach of all hands, and all are extended to pluck the golden fruit. Again, the progress of civilization and manufactures, the formation of stock companies, the issue of

shares, the syndicates and trusts, have furnished means of corruption hitherto unknown and far more subtle than those our fathers used. The vulgar bribe is out of fashion; the scientific corruption of our day proceeds directly, leaving scarcely more trace than the vegetable poisons of modern chemistry.—*M. Leroy Beaulieu.*

CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR AND GOOD CITIZENSHIP.—Evidence as to the growing disposition of Christian Endeavor Societies to place themselves in line with the Institute of Civics in efforts for the promotion of better civic conditions, continues to come to us from all directions. The Boston Ministers' meeting devoted a recent session to the discussion of this matter, when it was addressed by Treasurer William Shaw of the United Society of Christian Endeavor, who said: "The spirit of Christian Endeavor may be expressed by the motto, 'Do something, and do it now.' Neither the church nor the Christian Endeavor Society, as such, can enter the field of politics, but the individual Christians composing them must do so, else municipal corruption will never be purged away. We need not seek to commit the voter to any party nor advocate any candidate, but should aim to educate our youth to a sense of the sacred responsibility of the franchise, to exalt their ideal of good government, and to send them forth into their respective parties to elect Christian men, or at least men who will stand for honor and righteousness. Politicians do not fear the influence of Christians so long as they are content to pray in their churches and draw up resolutions in their conferences, but when they are ready to leave the prayer meeting, if need be, for the caucus, then the politicians begin to tremble." Because the young people are richer in good intentions and enthusiasm than in wisdom, Mr. Shaw pleaded for the sympathy and leadership of the pastors, who, he thought, could preach political purity with better prospect of success if they had behind them an army of educated and interested young people to go out into the world and realize their ideals.

Mr. C. H. Kilborn, chairman of the Good Citizenship Committee of the Boston C. E. Union, stated that each local society in the Boston Union was expected to appoint a committee for this work, to be held responsible for the enforcement of law in its own district; also that two rallies had been planned for in Boston, one to take place just before the regular election.

CHRISTIAN INDUSTRIAL LEAGUE.—A work intended to be conducted in the interest of those engaged in industrial pursuits has been entered upon under this name. The movement begins in Springfield, Mass., with thirty members. Rev. David Allen Reed, of the A. I. C., is president, J. A. Chamberlin vice-president, R. E. Todd secretary, and J. D. Parsons treasurer, and the foregoing and J. B. Adams, S. D. Sherwood, Manly Aiken, and E. E. Holton directors. Briefly stated, its object is to organize and train its members in local leagues to do personal Christian work and establish a sickness and death benefit association for its members who may wish to join the association.

PARTY RIGHT OR WRONG.—The criminal folly of the devotion to party "right or wrong" is forcibly illustrated by the results of the Tammany management of police affairs in New York, as set forth by Ex-Police Superintendent Murray, and evidenced by the recent action of Superintendent Byrnes, who has at last broken the fetters by which the Tammany commissioners prevented him from interfering with illegal liquor selling. The former and present superintendent furnish ample evidence of the fact that the New York commissioners of police have made it their first and most important purpose to use their almost unlimited powers for the benefit of the Tammany machine, and for the benefit of the whole people of the nation's metropolis, when not inconsistent with this primary object—and not otherwise. There can be no infamy more utterly damnable than that of thus prostituting the machinery of law, order, and justice to the uses of bandits who wear the garments of respectability and hold in line the silly sheep of the great party folds by flapping before them the badges which accredit them knaves as belonging to this or that "regular" political organization.

NO HONEST ASSESSORS.—The Civic Federation of Chicago is going into the question of municipal abuses in earnest. Postmaster Hesing, at a meeting on the ult., used the following plain language:

"Cook County has never had an honest tax assessor. It hasn't an honest assessor at this time, and it never will have as long as the present infamous system continues. This is the truth, and I don't care how it sounds.

"One word," he said, "will express the condition. Dishonesty. Dishonesty on the part of eminently respectable citizens as well as on the part of assessors. Whenever an assessor is bribed it is by an eminently respectable citizen. The small taxpayer cannot afford to bribe the assessor, and as a consequence the small taxpayers are paying double their proportion of taxes. As long as the people elect dishonest assessors this infamous discrimination will continue.

"The *Staats Zeitung* building is worth, with the ground upon which it stands, \$300,000. It is assessed at \$38,000. It ought to be assessed at \$100,000. At the rate at which it is assessed a poor man's home worth \$3,000 ought to be assessed at \$380. Now, I defy anybody to point out a house and lot valued at \$3,000 that is assessed at \$380. It is usually assessed at from \$1,000 to \$1,200, so it will be seen that the poor man is robbed, while the rich owner of a \$300,000 building escapes.

"Cook County has never had an honest assessor, has none at present, and will never have one under the present infamous system, and I don't care how it sounds. Bankruptcy threatens the city, all on account of the dishonesty of property owners and the willing assessors. Property on the down-town district bounded by the lake, the river, and Twelfth Street is estimated to be worth \$250,000,000, yet the total assessment of the entire 185 square miles of the city is but \$245,000,000. Property on the outside is assessed at one third its value, while the million-dollar down-town blocks are assessed at less than one tenth.

Were it not for such unjust discrimination the city revenues would be \$16,000,000, instead of \$11,000,000. The railroads and corporations are the worst tax-dodgers. They employ men whose profession it is to swear false oaths to assessment returns. No reform can be expected under the present system."

Mr. Hesing advocates a Board of Assessors similar to that of Boston, to be appointed by the mayor.

He was preceded by City Comptroller W. K. Ackerman, and was followed by W. D. Kerfoot, D. K. Tenney, and Miss Jane Adams, all of whom spoke in a similar strain. The Civic Federation has resolved to take up the subject of unequal assessments and corporation tax-dodging.

NEGLECT IN MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS.—It is rightly supposed that if the governments of cities and towns can be brought under rigid business principles—so that no longer they will be considered as "blotches upon the body politic"—and such reformation be made permanent, as it ought to be, that a greater or less improvement in both state and national governments would be the result.

Municipal government, both in its money relations as well as in respectability of character, has more direct claims on the people than in either state or national affairs; yet, is it not a curious fact that a large class of the people are guilty of the grossest neglect of municipal duties and seem to take more interest in those forms of politics whose influences are more remote.—*T. W. Braidwood, A. I. C.*

THE CURSE OF GAMBLING.—Police Superintendent Byrnes of New York says: "As horse racing is conducted now, it would be well for the community to stop racing altogether. We are sending men to prison right along on account of the race-gambling craze. Homes are being destroyed and the lives of young men blighted every day in this city for the same reason. What respectable man who knows the race-tracks for what they are, will to-day take his wife or his daughter to a race-track to see the races for the pleasure of seeing them? He must sit among a lot of over-dressed women, who yell and shout like men, and who act as decent men would be ashamed to act. To seat a good woman or a good girl among the horde of hardened, gambling-crazed females who are found in the grand stands on every racing day, is an insult to the entire sex. Respectable women do go, but among the crowd of bad women and worse men they look sadly out of place."

WHERE THE GOLD IS.—The amount of gold held by the national banks of the United States, by states, is shown in the abstract of the returns just completed in the office of the comptroller of currency. New York banks alone have \$25,000,000 more gold than the reserve in the treasury. Returns of July last include the following: New York, \$80,104,000; Illinois, \$26,406,000; Pennsylvania, \$21,296,000; Ohio, \$6,815,000; Minnesota, \$4,530,000; Wisconsin, \$3,824,000; Indiana, \$3,743,000; Missouri, \$3,616,000; Colorado, \$2,896,000; Michigan, \$2,723,000; Nebraska, \$2,469,000; Iowa, \$2,020,000; Kansas, \$1,207,000; Kentucky,

\$1,037,000 ; Montana, \$967,000 ; Arkansas, \$91,000 ; Mississippi, \$46,000 ; Oklahoma, \$45,000 ; Indian Territory, \$36,000.

CHRISTIAN VOTERS.—Joseph Cook some time since made the statement that "there are in the United States about five million of church members who are voters. If they were to unite to make the liquor traffic an outlaw, there is no political party that they could not bring to terms." Mr. Cook was asked to furnish the data for his remarkable statement, and he replies in the *New York Observer*. He quotes from Dr. H. K. Carroll's recent work on "The Religious Forces of the United States," which declares that in our population "nearly one person in every three in all ages is a Christian communicant." In view of this fact Mr. Cook says: "We have some 66,000,000 of people—Protestant and Catholics—of whom 20,000,000 are church members. Of these about 5,000,000 are now voters. Of this number, speaking roundly, not far from 4,000,000 are Protestants and 1,000,000 Catholics."

We do not believe there are so many church members in our country. Fifteen million would come nearer the truth, even if that figure is not too high. Still there is much force in Mr. Cook's conclusions. He says the estimate as to the voters is more than justified in a highly significant essay read before the National Temperance Congress at Saratoga, by Henry Randall Waite, president of the American Institute of Civics, and since published in *Our Day*. We quote: "In 1890 there were in the United States not less than 13,480,000 members of the Christian churches, exclusive of Roman Catholics, who enumerate in their fellowship all baptized persons, including infants. There was at the same time a total population of 62,622,000, with about 45,876,000 over the age of ten years, with 15,975,000 of voting age, of whom about 11,392,000 in the year 1888 exercised the right of suffrage. It is estimated that of the 13,480,000 church communicants, not more than five per cent, or 1,760,000, were under the age of twenty-one, and that of the remaining 12,374,000, sixty five per cent, or 8,043,000, were women, leaving in round numbers 4,331,000 church members who were of voting age. The number of Roman Catholics over the age of twenty-one (estimated at one fourth of the total Roman Catholic population of 8,277,000) was 2,069,750. Supposing sixty-five per cent of this number to be women, the Roman Catholic voters numbered 724,413. These, added to other male church members of voting age, would make a total of more than 5,000,000."

Mr. Waite would add to these voters the large number of regular attendants upon church services not communicants, but whose lives are confessedly subject to religious influence. In other words, in the year 1890 the number of those who may be supposed to have been in full sympathy with the doctrines of duty in society as set forth in the teachings of the church, was in the whole population considerably more than fifty-one per cent. Granting the conclusions here reached, what a mighty moral force could be hurled against the liquor traffic and all other evils threatening society, if American voters would exercise their suffrage with a view to uprooting those evils.—*Indiana Baptist*.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS.

DECEMBER, 1894.

THE CHINO-JAPANESE WAR AND THE EASTERN PROBLEMS.

BY REV. J. T. YOKOI.

I SHALL treat the subject under three heads: 1. The causes of the war. 2. The present warlike situation. 3. The eastern problems in the light of the war.

1. The causes of the war. The Chinese government and its advocates are never tired of accusing Japan with unreasonable demands and unjust aggression. They claim that China is suzerain over Corea, hence possessing the right of interference in the affairs of the peninsular kingdom. They argue, therefore, that Japan has no reason to take offense in the recent action of China toward Corea. But their argument is wholly vitiated through a mistaken premise. For Corea is not tributary to China. All the Corean treaties with foreign powers prove beyond a shadow of doubt the fact that Corea is an independent kingdom; so that China's claim of suzerainty is but a mere fiction. Besides, it is significant that every one of China's advocates completely ignores the existence of the Tien-Tsin treaty of 1885. In that treaty it was agreed between China and Japan that both should at once withdraw their troops from Corea and that if in future either country wanted to send troops there it should notify the other beforehand.

Now, according to these terms of the treaty, three things are perfectly clear: (1) that China has no more right and privilege toward Corea than Japan; (2) that if she ever felt called upon to interfere she should do so in a way that would be perfectly

friendly to Japan ; (3) that Japan has just as much right to send troops into Corea when necessary as China. I believe it can be fully shown that China's recent course in Corea was the practical denial of every one of these three points. But this fact alone perhaps did not really constitute the reasons for Japan's action. We must remember cool legal reasons count little in the actions of nations, as in those of individuals. But China has injured the sentiment of the Japanese people to its deepest depth.

The histories of the two nations, as all are aware, during the past thirty or forty years have marched in two divergent lines, if not in opposite directions. Japan has represented progress, enlightenment, and civilization, while China, tradition, conservatism, and stagnation. Priding herself in her hoary traditions and evident immense resources, China has always treated her island neighbor in a most slighting and exasperating manner. This has especially been the case in reference to the affairs of Corea. Japan, ever since 1876 when she concluded the treaty with Corea and introduced her to the nations of the world, wanted to induce her to enter the path of progress and civilization. For Japan early realized that her own safety, as well as the safety of Eastern Asia, consisted not in standing selfishly aloof from the welfare of the continental neighbors and making the most of herself, but in keeping in close relationship with them, so that each might help the other toward the establishment of strong and independent states. She knew that at the bottom of all international difficulties of modern times was almost always the race question ; hence, that if she were ever to play the part of a strong and independent power in the affairs of the world, she could do so only through the alliance and coöperation of the other nations of the yellow race. For this reason she wanted to see Corea civilized and strong, able to maintain her ground against the encroachments of aggressive Russia and omnipresent England.

And not only with Corea, but even much more so with China, Japan wanted to live in the close bond of friendship consistent with her progressive and expansive growth. This may be seen

through the conciliatory spirit that has guided the mikado's government in all its diplomatic relations with these countries. But China has been, on the contrary, filled with the blind infatuation of her own invincible strength. Again and again disclaiming all right of authority over Corea whenever placed in positions of responsibility, no sooner was the difficulty removed than she would again naively and quietly assume and exercise the right to interfere in all Corean matters. She has not only opposed the good offices of Japan for the reform and civilization of Corea, but all the while backed up Corea's barbarous and corrupt administration. Every attempt at reform and progress was stifled in the bud through the interference of China.

For eleven long years two able and noble-hearted Coreans, one of them a prince of the highest rank, took refuge in Japan and pleaded and begged for aid to civilize and save their people from national extinction. The other of them, Kim-ok-kim, was finally decoyed with false promises to visit Shanghai and was there cruelly murdered; and his remains and the murderer were both sent over to Corea in a Chinese warship. It was no more than to say to Japan, "All your mimickings after European ways and manners count for nothing; see how you are always outwitted!"

The Coreans, too, misunderstanding the generous and conciliatory motives which have actuated Japan, came gradually to regard her as a weak and good-for-nothing neighbor and looked upon China as a powerful kingdom and her only protector. We can, therefore, imagine the state of feelings the Japanese people were thrown into when the report that China sent troops into Corea was flashed throughout the country. Their patience was now exhausted; their only course was to gird up their loins for war.

The war between Japan and China is, therefore, the struggle between civilization and progress on the one hand, and conservatism and stagnation on the other. Whether the East will hereafter maintain its independence and grow in prosperity, or the Asiatic nationalities will be before long swept away and the yellow races subjected to slavery, is a question whose decision rests largely upon the outcome of the present conflict.

2. The present warlike situation. On the 12th of June the first Japanese army some two thousand strong was landed at Chemulpo and immediately marched on to Söul. There they have occupied strategic positions and waited for the development of events. About a week previous to this a Chinese army some three thousand strong was landed and stationed at Asan, some fifty miles south of Söul. The two armies did not come into collision for more than a month and a half. Ostensibly there was no reason why they should fight with each other. For the Japanese troops were sent there for the protection of the mikado's subjects and their interests, and the Chinese army was stationed for the suppression of the To-goku-To insurgents. But China demanded the withdrawal of the Japanese army, while Japan demanded the administrative reforms of Corea, and invited China to join in aiding Corea to carry these measures through. China intrigued with the Corean government, while at the same time she kept pouring in troops across the Manchurian frontier. Japan insisted on the reforms and the withdrawal of the Chinese armies.

The commencement of hostilities was now regarded to be but a question of time, and on the 25th of July it was actually opened through the naval battle between the two rival nations, and on the 30th the Japanese army routed the Chinese garrison at Asan, destroying at one blow the Chinese strength in Southern Corea. Just one month and a half elapsed when, on the 16th of September, the great victory of Pyng-Yang was gained by the Japanese, which practically destroyed the Chinese army in Northern Corea, and on the 17th the great naval battle was fought off the mouth of the Yalu, which swept the Chinese fleet from the face of the northern seas. Since then Japan's Corean army under Marshal Yamagata, and another army under Marshal Oyama, recently landed on a northern coast of the Gulf of Pechili, have been vigorously pushing for Moukden and Peking.

We can hardly realize the difficulties under which they are pushing in the aggressive movement, and which cause so much delay in the attainment of the objects in view. The chief

among these difficulties, it is said, is the bad condition of the roads, or perhaps more truly the non-existence of the roads, especially in Northern Corea and Manchuria, which makes it particularly difficult for the transportation of food supplies and heavy guns. All parties seem, however, to be agreed now (at this writing, November 1) that the fall of the two northern capitals of China is but the question of weeks, very likely of days. The policy of the commanding generals seems to be to push on steadily to the satisfactory end without running into hasty and needless risks.

3. Eastern problems in the light of the present war. It is interesting to note how sudden and complete was the change of attitude which the European, particularly the British, public opinion managed to assume after the great victory of Pyng-Yang. It is no less than revolutionary. When the peerless Fuji, which is 12,000 feet high, suddenly emerged in one night out of the plain, it could not have seemed any more wonderful than the sudden discovery before the eyes of astonished Europe of New Japan in the horizon of the far East. The words of the London *Spectator* are so interesting, as the frank confession of past and present opinions about Japan and Asia, that I venture to quote at some length. It says in the editorial of September 29:

The British public does not yet realize how complete an overturn of all ideas about Asia, and all policies in which Asia is involved, has been effected by what the Japanese have already accomplished. A central idea of Europe as to Asia was that the brown men and the yellow men were men who had ceased to advance or change, . . . who would remain as they are, possibly for centuries, certainly for a long period of time, at once immovable and weak. It followed that the white races who are still advancing could deal with them very nearly as they pleased, could regulate their commerce, punish their departures from western notions of right, or even, if the necessity were great and the temptation strong, could conquer them as Russia has done in the North, or England has done in India, and as France has begun to do in Indo-China. A few more years, an expedition or two, and some more treaties, and the whole of Asia would be at the feet of Europe to be guided, controlled, and in one way and another taxed at European discretion. . . . Suddenly, as it were in a week, the old central idea is dispelled, and all the policies based upon it are shown to be dangerous or worthless. It becomes apparent to the most blind that one Asiatic power at least is neither dead nor moribund ;

that it has not only all the strength, but all the energy of a European power; that it can fight effectually at a distance from its own shores; that it can operate successively by sea as well as by land; that in future in all warlike operations in Eastern Asia, it must be reckoned with as if its people were white men. Japan can not be coerced or even bullied any more, for no power could attack her without all the expense and risk which would attend a European campaign. . . . That the yellow races are not immovable but can improve, can develop fighting strength, can use the "resources of science," the enchanted armor in which Europe fancied herself panoplied forever—that is the new fact of 1894, and we do not know that it may not prove the greatest fact of this half of the century.

Such is the complete and sudden, nay the revolutionary, change of European opinion in regard to Japan and Asia. But there seems to be one thing which Europe yet begrudges to credit Japan with. She seems to think that Japan, though already in possession of European arts and sciences, is yet particularly apt to fall into acts of "barbarity" and moral "callousness." The leading British journals, conspicuously the *Spectator* among the number, give vent to the sense of dread and uncertainty in regard to the future of Asia and of Europe. They fear that through Japanese leadership a revival of Zhengis Khan's despotic and barbarous empire may not be impossible, so that Europe with all its arts and civilization will be one day submerged in the deluge of Asiatic invasion.

Now I am utterly at a loss to know what international acts or social feature of Japan these people have in mind when they speak of "Japanese barbarity" or "Japanese callousness." Even in the case of the recent Kow-shung affair, although at first almost the entire British press raised an uproar against "the Japanese barbarity," has it not been since demonstrated that Japan was in the right, that she did not outstrip either the limit of international law or of humanity? Have not the strict discipline and blameless conduct of the mikado's soldiers elicited praise from every European and won his confidence? Have not, moreover, Europeans been invariably treated in Japan with courtesy and friendliness which have won the gratitude of all travelers? Except those few residents in Japan whose self-interests make them unwilling to give up the

positions of great and unfair advantages once wrested from Japan in the days of her ignorance, who is there on the face of the whole earth to stand up and present facts to show that the Japanese nation is liable to barbarous acts?

Indeed, it seems not a little incongruous that Englishmen who allow their Indian government to monopolize the manufacture of opium, and who pursue the policy of compulsory importation of this poisonous drug into China, who are backing up the corrupt Turkish government because of the jealousy of Russia, whose army together with the French in 1861 plundered and afterward burned the magnificent summer palace in Peking, and whose heartless treatment of weaker races is the standing rebuke of history,—for them to accuse Japan with “barbarity” and “callousness” seems to me, to say the least, quite incongruous.

From what I have said it seems to me that the following things are made clear:

1. Already as a result of the war the balance of power in the far East is sifted. Henceforth it shall be no longer China but Japan that holds the key of the eastern situation. Whatever European power wants to gain predominance in Asia will have to win the friendship, and if possible the alliance, of Japan. Aside from the fact of her military and naval strength she has the advantage of position and immense coal resources. If Japan consents to ally herself with Russia, the combined forces can easily sweep away the power of Great Britain from Asia. If she coöperates with Great Britain, the two fleets can destroy every outlet of Russia on the Pacific and thus make her advance in Central Asia impossible. I venture to think Mr. Curzon and Sir Charles Dilke will have to revise pretty radically some of their statements in regard to the situation in the far East.

2. It looks as if the independence and civilization of the Hermit Kingdom is now guaranteed. Japan is in honor bound to do her best to help, and Corea without the baneful influence of China will now begin to wake up to life and progress with new vision of the future before her.

3. Will not China, too, wake up after this long period of deathlike sleep? There are not only immense natural resources within her extensive territories, but immense talents as well among her three hundred millions. Her past administration has indeed been corrupt through and through, but there is no reason why this corruption should not be swept away. The Chinese people know the value of business honesty. Why shall they not learn the value of administrative honesty? They are capable of religious and political enthusiasm, as was amply proved in the case of the great Tai-Ping rebellion forty years ago. Why shall they not be infused with new national or political enthusiasm which will carry them along in the tide of progress and civilization?

But, on the other hand, China might turn out to be but a problem. She may after all be found to be too unwieldy and too far gone as one social fabric for reformation and regeneration. Widespread insurrections may break out; court intrigues may make an efficient, centralized administration impossible; in that case total disorganization and anarchy will be the result. Such may become the condition of China ten or twenty years hence. If so, the China problem—What shall we do with China?—will engage the keenest interest of the European powers. Her eighteen provinces will then become a theater of European intrigues and encroachments, not unlikely hostile conflicts. And while her people will probably flourish and multiply and scatter themselves through every clime and every zone, everywhere despised and hated, but everywhere gaining a foothold, another but more powerful and numerous race of Jews, yet at the same time her hoary nationality will be no more. China will then be nothing but a geographical name. But I hope, I believe, that such will not be the case. I trust that New China will yet arise, as a new and vigorous stem out of an old trunk, and before the twentieth century is half gone, she will be exerting her influence as one of the few greatest nations of the earth.

Thus I venture to be optimistic. And I see before me a vision of the new and regenerated East. Japan, Corea, and

China united in the bond of common race and aim, marching together in the path of progress and enlightenment. For it is impossible to foretell what great impetus this sudden uprising of the Japanese nation will give to all latent and active movements toward liberty and light, which really fill whole Asia. Just to give one instance, the success of New Japan cannot but greatly encourage the hearts of those Indian patriots who are pushing under such great discouragements the congress movement there. It is not, therefore, mere Utopia to hope to see before many decades are passed not only the three countries in the North but also India in full possession of the arts and mechanical appliances of the West, and, at the same time, filled and permeated with the great truths of God and man, the truths of eternal hope and courage for the individual and collective life of humanity, which Jesus so ideally and exaltedly represents for all ages. Surely the words of the late Mr. G. H. Pearson seem much more true to-day than when written, though it was but four years ago. He said (Pearson's "National Life and Character," p. 85):

The citizens of these countries [meaning yellow and black races] will then be taken up into the social relations of the white races, will throng the English turf or the salons of Paris, and will be admitted to intermarriage. It is idle to say that if all this should come to pass our pride of place will not be humiliated. We were struggling among ourselves for supremacy in a world which we thought of as destined to belong to the Aryan races and to the Christian faith; to the letters and arts and charm of social manners which we have inherited from the best times of the past. We shall wake to find ourselves elbowed and hustled, and perhaps even thrust aside, by peoples whom we looked down upon as servile and thought of as bound always to minister to our needs.

I for one certainly hope that some day such an opportunity may yet be given to the Hindoos, the Chinese, and the Africans, and I am sure the Americans who own the heritage of the noble ideas and examples of Washingtons and Lincolns, will not begrudge any opportunity for so-called lower races to rise higher. When such an opportunity is given, then both the West and the East will be civilized. There will be neither high nor low, neither bond nor free, but all shall be one. When

there are no more lands and peoples to subjugate or obtain some unfair advantages from, the nations of Europe will have no more occasion for war. For the first time all peoples will begin to live in the spirit of friendly emulation, instead of selfish competition. They shall act and react, stimulating and influencing, each upon the other, for higher attainments and nobler accomplishments. And thus and thus only shall the day be ushered, that great and longed-for day, "When the peoples shall beat their swords into ploughshares, their spears into pruninghooks; and nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

J. T. YOKOL.

PULLMAN AND PATERNALISM.

BY CHARLES H. EATON.

ONE of the most persistent claims made in connection with the administration of the town of Pullman is that it embodies paternalism. A writer in the *Non-Sectarian* describes Pullman City (*sic*) as a "notable instance of the worst form of paternal government." The Springfield (Mass.) *Republican* says, "He [Mr. Pullman] believes in paternalistic methods and has put them in operation at his works to a degree not equaled anywhere else in America." A well-known political economist writes, "The town of Pullman is a species of benevolent feudalism." We would inquire into the truth of these assertions. Is there paternalism at Pullman?

Before this question can be satisfactorily answered we must decide what paternalism is. It is a term used in a great variety of ways and often without definite meaning. Paternalism in government is an historical conception which came into prominence in the seventeenth century in England, through the discussions of Locke and Filmer. According to this view, the power of a sovereign is like that of the father of a family. The rights of the king and the duties of the subject were those arising from the parental relation. With a democratic form of government, such paternalism is manifestly impossible. But it is asserted that there has been established a new form of paternalism in the relation of the rich and powerful to the poor and weak. The position of the capitalist at Pullman, it is said, is like that of the baron in feudal times. Under that system the lord owned all the land, and the people at the foot of the hill on which stood his castle were slaves. They could own no land, they could build no homes. They could not, indeed, exercise the rights of personal freedom. The peasant was

inseparable from his lord's estate, transferred with it from one owner to another. With the change from serfdom to wagedom the serf became a "seller of service" and a freeman. The factory system has made feudalism forever impossible. The fundamental rights of workingmen cannot now be disturbed. Possessing personal liberty, he is free to move from place to place, to choose his own employer and home, to sell his labor in any market, and by increasing his wealth increase his social importance. The most active imagination could hardly make it possible to discover the "robber baron" of the Middle Ages in the modern employer of labor in Pullman or any other manufacturing town in America.

But let us make a more specific examination of paternalism. Paternalism, in the modern sense of the term, undertakes (1) to provide civil government, and (2) to house, clothe, feed, educate, and amuse the people.

The charge of paternalism in the government of Pullman is on its face absurd. The land purchased for the site of the town was not outside of, or far removed from, other towns or civil authority, as, for instance, in the case of Salt Lake City. The town of Pullman has had from the beginning no separate civic existence. It was at first within and a part of the town of Hyde Park, and its government was by selectmen. In 1892 the town of Hyde Park, including Pullman, became a part of the city of Chicago, entitled to its representation on the board of aldermen. Before under the municipal ordinances of Hyde Park, it has been since then under those of Chicago.

But it may be asserted that while there is no formal paternalism, there is such intimidation and interference with political action that practical paternalism is brought about. A visit to Pullman by one who invites confidence by appearance and manner discloses as much freedom on the part of the workingmen as is found elsewhere among the same class. A careful inquiry made by the writer of this article elicited a very general expression that such intimidation did not exist. While it was in some cases declared that one must not make himself obnoxious in the expression of his views, it was added with

much practical sense, "the Australian ballot makes intimidation impossible."

The political position of Mr. Pullman is well known. Without passing judgment upon the wisdom or unwisdom of his views of the tariff, it may be said that beyond such arguments and careful presentations of the pros and cons as free speech encourages, no pressure of any kind is brought to bear upon the men. During the first Cleveland campaign, a long-time resident of Pullman and a prominent employee of the company addressed several thousand men on the public green in advocacy of Mr. Cleveland's election to the presidency. And, although Mr. Cleveland has been twice elected to that office, this man still remains a good Democrat and in the employ of the company.

If we are to believe the accounts of certain critics, the workmen in the shops do not dare to open their lips, the stores are under the control of Pullman bosses, and the system of espionage is so complete that the whole town lies in sullen and silent subjection. Being familiar with these descriptions, it seemed a little strange on a recent visit to find the employees talking with entire freedom, praising and blaming overseers and officers with an easy manner born only of long habit.

If the methods of an autocratic government obtain, it would seem natural that the keepers of stores in the Arcade would hesitate to sell a book published by a clergyman of Pullman, the value of which is almost entirely destroyed by its exaggerated and inaccurate statements, the whole constituting a violent and most unjust attack upon the Pullman Company. But upon asking for a copy it was immediately produced. The only difference between this and other factory towns is, that with equal or larger freedom, the most healthful and stimulating surroundings are afforded. Indeed, one of the marked beauties of the town is the apparent independence of its men.

That there may be unjust task-masters, or that there may be attempts on the part of subordinate officers to curry favor with the management by unduly crowding workmen and controlling their political action, may be true. But such action is contrary to the desire and policy of the president and superior officers of

the company and could be controlled only by a paternalism which not even Russia knows. The "right of petition" has always been recognized, and the humblest laborer has not been denied access by proper means to those in authority. The management of Pullman has not and could not decide the character of its civil government. A mere statement of the municipal relations of the town is a sufficient denial of this form of paternalism.

Paternalism also undertakes to house, clothe, feed, educate, and amuse those under its control. Since the building and renting of houses is the most important and conspicuous part of the plan of Pullman, we will consider that last and deal with other functions of this form of government. Paternalism undertakes to clothe, feed, educate, and amuse the people. Certainly the management of Pullman does not attempt to do this. It has indeed built two arcades in which are to be found markets and stores. But these are rented to any applicant from any place precisely as they are rented in other towns. The corporation has no interest whatever in the profits or losses or methods of the business and exercises no control over them. The "truck system," which was long in existence in factory towns, by which a portion of the wages of workmen was paid in groceries or provisions in the stores conducted by the company, never had existence in Pullman. The evils of this system have been avoided at Pullman by making the shops dependent upon private and not upon corporate enterprise and support.

The control of education is the same as in other wards of the city. A theater has been built, but free entertainments are not given. It is managed on a business basis. First-class performances are given by the same companies as in Chicago, but at about half the cost. The appearance of charity is avoided. The income of the theater just about equals its expense account. If there be a loss it is met by the company. Athletic grounds with tracks and stands are furnished, but the formation and support of athletic associations are left to the interest of the townspeople. A library of eight thousand volumes has been given by Mr.

Pullman and established in rooms that combine convenience and beauty. The inclination to make it absolutely free was resisted on principle. In order to free it from any taint of paternalism and to encourage a feeling of independence, the library was given to a voluntary association, membership of which requires a small fee. These fees only pay for the current magazines for the reading-rooms and a portion of the amount required for the repair of books. The salaries of the librarian and attendants and the repairs of the rooms are met by the company. The library has been the center of a considerable educational influence. Classes in stenography, history, languages, literature, art, and civics have been formed, for joining which only a nominal fee has been charged. The practical results have been large.

A writer in *THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICS* contrasts Pullman and Saltaire, founded by Sir Titus Salt, to the disadvantage of the former. Saltaire is embodied paternalism. All or nearly all the conditions supplied in the English town exist at Pullman, but they have not come by the gift of the Pullman Company, but as a part of a commercial plan, and they are maintained by the interest of the men. The basis and encouragement of effort were afforded. But to the mind of the projector of Pullman free gifts savor too much of paternalism. To earn is better than to receive as a gift. The truest philanthropy is to help men to help themselves. A striking example of the method adopted may be found in the organization of the Pullman Band. The committee on organization came to Mr. Pullman for a subscription. Not because he was unwilling to give, but because his own experience had led him to see the worth of individual effort and the satisfaction of independence, he declined to make a gift, but pointed out a plan by which they could borrow the necessary money on easy terms and gradually liquidate the debt. This was quickly and successfully done. The athletic grounds were laid out with the same idea in view. A prosperous association was organized by similar methods, and some very important contests have taken place on the grounds and the neighboring lake.

A word may be allowed on religious training in Pullman. A

beautiful church was built, and at an actual cost of not more than six hundred dollars per year, for the company bears the expense of janitor and heating, a commodious and beautiful structure is furnished to whatsoever people will pay the annual rental. At present it is occupied by the Presbyterians. There are also Methodist and Roman Catholic organizations in the town. On the west side of the railroad tracks land has been given to the Roman Catholics and Swedish Methodists where they have erected church buildings. There is and can be no interference with the conduct of the religious life of the people. The custom which has obtained in some factory towns of New England, so undesirable and so unjust, of deducting pew rent from the wages of the workingmen, there has never been any attempt to introduce in Illinois. The whole theory of the town as to clothing, feeding, educating, and amusing the people has been as far as possible from paternalism.

The only direction in which the charge of paternalism seems to have a shadow of justification is in the plan adopted of building houses and renting them to the employees of the company. What has the company really done? In 1880 it purchased land fourteen miles from Chicago, laid out streets, paved them, built houses of an unusually convenient and substantial character, furnished them with water and gas, and so far as possible perfect sanitary conditions, and then surrounded them and its well-built and well-ventilated shops with parks and flowers, lakes and trees. The object of the founder was "to establish a great manufacturing business on the most substantial basis possible." As a necessary condition of this it was decided to build homes that should attract the best grade of mechanics and so control them and the town as to keep out saloons, brothels, and all other objectionable buildings, and at the same time supply an object lesson in the building and care of the houses of workingmen and their surroundings. To do this it was necessary that the company refuse to sell any of its property. The results so far as the external life of the town is concerned are to be seen by every visitor. After an examination of the town, its poorest rather than its best quarters, after

studying its back alleys and hidden corners, and comparing it with adjoining towns and with factory towns, with many of which the writer has been familiar from his youth up, it may be justly said that Pullman far excels any other town of its kind in the country.

Let him who would appreciate the real contribution made to the physical and moral welfare of the people leave the well-paved, well-sewered, and well-cleaned streets of Pullman, with its neat and convenient houses, and walk for five minutes along the half-laid-out streets of Kensington, with its open sewers, its piles of decaying vegetation, its pools of stagnant water, its ill-ventilated and tumble-down tenements, its scores of liquor shops and houses of doubtful character. It is no wonder workingmen not employed in the Pullman shops desert such quarters for the brighter and healthier surroundings of the model town, though it be farther from their places of employment. Many in the higher walks of life, after vainly seeking for as good accommodations at equal cost in Chicago proper return with a great sense of relief to Pullman. This result has been possible only by the absolute control of property rights.

It is desirable that so far as possible all working people own their own homes. It is a wise policy that encourages the investment of one's savings in a homestead. Ownership gives birth to responsibility and character. Improvement in the character of the workingman by a natural economic law leads to an increase in wages and the profits of capital. But experience shows that in all communities the owners of houses are in the minority. The great majority are tenants of the houses built and rented to them by others. We have come to think the erection and care of tenement houses of importance enough to justify philanthropic investigation and legislative enactment. The promiscuous character of the workingmen at Pullman, as in other manufacturing towns, makes an effective supervision of the houses impossible except under a central and complete control.

There are two things to be said in this connection which remove the force of the charge of paternalism. (1) The town of Pullman is so situated that it comes into constant competition

with other towns like Kensington, Roseland, and Gano, none of them more than twelve minutes' walk from the administration building. Here houses may be purchased or rented. The rents range a trifle higher in Pullman, but when the superior accommodations in relation to sanitary and other conditions afforded are considered, this seems natural and fair. Indeed, houses in these places would remain unoccupied unless the rents were lower. (2) The company has always encouraged its employees to buy their own homes and nearly nine hundred have done so in neighboring towns, all within convenient distance of the shops. If Pullman were in a desert, or even if the condition of employment were the occupation of a company house, the claim of paternalism might be justified. In the acceptance of men since the strike the course adopted was that equal privileges be granted men who owned their own houses with those who rented of the company, *i. e.*, both had equal chances of being taken back. The statements of the working-men seem unanimous that the only suggestion made at any time was that in slack times those living in the houses of the company would be more certain to have permanent employment. The practical force of this feeling and the amount of interference may be seen in the fact that less than one third of the Pullman employees were tenants of the company at the time of the strike.

It would appear from some discussions of the subject that the Pullman experiment is something entirely novel in principle; that Mr. Pullman with the thirst of dominion which belonged to the medieval baron had undertaken to do something never before attempted. The difference between his policy as to the building of homes for operatives and that of manufacturers generally is not a difference in principle. It is the ordinary custom to build houses for the workmen and control them. The difference is in the character and surroundings of the homes furnished. A writer on political economy in speaking of factory towns says: "The tenements in which operatives are housed are such as to make physical health and moral character impossible. They are generally owned by the corporation and

built near the work without regard to the sanitary condition of the surroundings. Frequently from six to ten or more families are crowded into one building with but one entrance and not even having a back door or anything approaching modern conveniences." It would seem that the chief offense of Mr. Pullman is the complete eradication of these evils, and the establishment of a town where the social position of the workingmen is vastly improved. No charge of paternalism is made against other manufacturers for the ownership of death-traps and moral pest-houses, but the moment a man undertakes to build upon a business basis homes where healthy and happy childhood and a virtuous and robust manhood may be trained, while personal liberty is in no way interfered with—he is a promoter of paternalism, a tyrant without justice or generosity.

Another criticism, curiously inconsistent with the charge of paternalism, is based upon the fact that the design was to so regulate the building and management of the houses that they should pay six per cent on the investment. As a matter of fact, they have never paid more than four and one half per cent, sometimes less. This, it is said, is an example of greed and unholy avarice. But we do not complain of Peabody, but rather extol his wisdom, when he announces the principle of intelligent aid in improving the homes of the people to be "philanthropy and five per cent." It has been found that homes may be furnished convenient and affording privacy and sanitary appliances on this basis. Many tenement blocks exist in England and a smaller number in America where "philanthropy and five per cent" has shown itself to be the truest benevolence.

The more careful the examination of Pullman, the clearer it will appear that paternalism does not exist there, and when the analysis is made it will be found that those who decry the paternalism of the town most, do so because to their thinking it is not paternal enough. As an intelligent resident of the town, entirely independent of the company, remarked in answer to the question, "Is there paternalism in Pullman?" "No, paternalism in Pullman is all humbug."

CHAS. H. EATON.

THE REPUBLIC IN THE COURT OF REASON: A REPLY TO PRESIDENT ELIOT.

BY THOMAS BURKE GRANT.

IN A recent paper* marked by that happy abstraction characteristic of a man of large responsibilities, betraying all the dignity and erudition befitting the head of a great American university, and suggestive also, it may be said, of the hopeful optimism peculiar to the executive of a great vested corporation, President Eliot furnishes us with some reasons why the American Republic can endure.

Whether we are indebted to President Eliot for this paper to a doubt on his part as to the stability of our form of government, or to the indulgence of a refined literary taste which furnishes recreation to our foremost men, does not appear;† but it is obvious that the question thus raised, and which has forced itself upon the attention of our thinking men within the past five years, is one having important consequences, and therefore deserves to be treated in a thorough manner and as a surgeon would treat a deep wound—with a sharp probe. Though the president of Harvard College is the only man who has had the courage to handle this testy question in a public way, he is only one out of thousands who have asked themselves what mean these new drifts in our national life. Can the ship of state sail through the billows and currents of contending factions? Or to give a more pointed turn to these inquiries, in the language of the late Chief Justice Joseph Story, “Shall Americans betray America?” While, therefore, we are indebted to President Eliot for providing us with the opportunity for discussing the vital questions involved in these queries, and also for his agree-

* *Forum* for October.

† Since this article was written I have learned that President Eliot was replying to an article by Prof. H. von Holst in *The Journal of Political Economy*.

able and entertaining method of treating the subject, we are by no means under the same obligations to accept the conclusions at which he seems to have arrived.

To many people who have considered the basis of our government and its practical application to the complexities of our national life, not from the cloister or from the schoolroom, but from the standpoint of men of the world, it will be evident that the president of Harvard has missed all the most important considerations necessary to form a correct and conclusive judgment of the subject he has undertaken to place before us. The growing distrust of the people, the antagonisms generated between American citizens of native birth or descent and American citizens of foreign birth; the decay of public spirit; the trickery of politicians; the shameless corruption of our municipal life; the growing ascendancy of wealth; the indifference and apathy of men of fortune to discharge the duties which the possession of property implies; the growth of demagoguery among the people, their unthinking hostility to great private interests,—all these one would think ought to enter into speculations about the durability of government. But, on the contrary, President Eliot, for some mysterious reason, seems to avoid these issues. Instead of handling them, as we might expect, he indulges in a series of hopeful conclusions, scarcely justified by a study of the political fabric of our republican government.

His series of seven principal reasons showing why the republic can endure appear to be so weak, inconclusive, and halting, that if President Eliot had started out with the intention of demonstrating the instability and evanescence of republican institutions, he could not have hoped for better success than has attended his notable effort to allay the national anxiety, and to satisfy our afflicted and heterogeneous family that the stricken patient is doing quite nicely. It may be that the president of Harvard College felt a certain embarrassment in treating the worst and most dangerous symptoms. It may be that as the head of a famous seat of learning, almost concurrent with the life of the republic itself, and which owed its origin to a desire to perpetuate republican institutions, by making the claims of

caste and of wealth the ruling spirits of the nation, that he could not with any consistency fly in the face of the college traditions. Perhaps the able publicist could not entirely disassociate himself from the theorist and the doctrinaire; but to whatever cause due, the omissions already mentioned run through his speculations, and in my opinion nullify many of President Eliot's pleasant conclusions.

No possible aspect in which the republic now presents itself to us, or which it is likely to assume in the immediate future, ought to be overlooked if the public is to get a complete view and to form a clear, calm, and dispassionate judgment on this vital and absorbing question. The public temper also demands the most thorough investigation of the patient's disease, and to use the language of another great educator (Prof. H. von Holst of the University of Chicago), the people "are likely to hold up the hands of those who probe the festering sore, and to frown down those who think they serve the country best by covering up the wound with a sweetly scented cloth." Accepting this assurance and believing that a spirit of patriotism and of duty alike call for courageous handling of the issues, I submit the points regarding which it seems to me President Eliot fails to meet the difficulty that confronts us.

This duty devolves upon us all the more urgently because of all those forms of government under which nations have organized themselves, that of a republic is most likely to lose its original characteristics, and to drift into reaction on the one hand, or into the popular abuse of power on the other. Indeed, the eminent writer in question admits this by starting his pleasant generalizations with the somewhat discomfiting proposition that the governments called republics in the past have without exception been all notable failures. Here the question will at once suggest itself on the abstract proposition, Then why should we hope for better or different results to those obtained in Greece, in Venice, and Rome? The president of Harvard College, by way of answering this obvious and logical query, discovers certain conditions here which did not manifest themselves in the republics of old. In the face of the fact that

the country has lately seen the gathering of a number of armies unprecedented in the world's history since the days of Walter the Penniless, and all demanding a chance to live, President Eliot sees a prospect of more "diffused happiness," and notwithstanding that thirty years ago ninety-one per cent of the American people owned ninety-one per cent of the total wealth of the country and that now nine per cent of the people own eighty-five per cent of the national wealth, he assumes the possibility of a greater "diffusion of wealth." In addition to this, better social conditions, better domestic relations, greater toleration of religion, the safeguards thrown around the country by a free press, corporation service, mutual dependence of man and man, and the comforting assurances of religion constitute the chief differences between this republic and those of old. All these President Eliot thinks will eventually set us right.

But do all these conditions exist in the same unctious degree set forth by President Eliot? Again it may be asked, do they each and all tend to the stability of our government, and are we not threatened by serious danger from some of them, instead of being made more secure? A consideration of our circumstances will show that we are sailing over the same course, beset by the same dangers, flying the same flag, confronted with the same bold rocks and shifting quicksands as all past republics. In short, we are like a ship entering an unknown and an un-navigated harbor strewn on all sides with the wrecks of former republics, and sailing over a sandbar which has never permitted a republican barque to pass undamaged in the long course of the world's history. The Hebrew Republic, the republics of Sparta and of Athens, those of Thebes and Carthage, Rome, Venice, Florence, and the Dutch Republic, all serve as warnings to us to suppress those enervating luxuries, the internal quarrels, the greed, the avarice and ambition which carried them down into the whirlpools of passion and eventually caused their absorption by great empires. Not one of these republics, when it failed, was ever succeeded by a republic, but always by a monarchy. It may be said here that France is to-day a republic, but here is the opinion of one of the most eminent of Frenchmen: "What

did we not expect from the republic when we were under the empire? Ah, when we have the republic! Well, the republic came and has failed in all its promises and in all the ideas that engendered it," says M. Emile Zola in an interview published September 4, 1894.

The history of the chief republics in Europe gives us no guarantee of the stability of republican institutions. Has it any brighter or better side in that portion of America outside of the United States? Mexico boasts of a republic, but not of a popular government. President Diaz has sustained himself to the south of us, but has he entirely quelled the embers of insurrection in the land of the Montezumas? Only last year there was a determined effort to restore the throne of Brazil, and the army and the navy of that country as well as its prominent leaders were pitted against each other in civil strife. Chili had its dictator and its revolution in the days of Balmaceda, and Argentine securities through the mismanagement of its public men remind us of nothing so much as the great South Sea Bubble in the days of George III. As for the other South American republics, any one of them seems fortunate if it completely escapes some sort of a revolution for six months at a time. The political upheavals of republican institutions in America give no greater guarantee for stability than those of Europe. All provide splendid fields for intrigue, dictators, and usurpation. The American Republic stands alone, the last hope for popular government.

Now what are the reasons which President Eliot gives to insure this republic in the face of the terrible lessons of the ruined republics that lie around and behind us? The president of Harvard College says that we differ in certain respects from all the other republics of history. Let us see. The first of Mr. Eliot's reasons for stability here is the greater toleration of religion. The question of religious toleration would be quite pertinent to the discussion if religious intolerance had caused the fall of Greece, of Venice, or of Rome, or if it was to-day the main cause of commotion in our South American neighbors. Paganism, it is true, did not as fully meet the wants of its time

as Christianity does those of to-day. But the fact that it nevertheless answered the ancients for all the essential acts of Christianity and therefore had all the force of a strong religious principle, is somewhat unfortunate for his contention. There was the fullest toleration in Greece and Rome, for the best of all reasons that there was but one religion at the time, and no rivalries between creeds as there is with us. The pivotal principle in Grecian and Roman life was fear of the gods, a devoted love of country, and firm belief in the destiny of an overruling Providence. A future state of reward and of punishment was ever present to the minds of Roman citizens, whose children were trained from infancy to observance of all those precepts which deplored vice and which called forth the friendship and the conciliation of the gods. It was a religion, too, which penalized and prohibited perjury, which inculcated justice between man and man, and which inspired the people to the performance of martial and heroic deeds. The Romans tolerated the gods of every country, entering into their vast hegemony. They even erected a temple to the unknown God, and outside of war religion was perhaps the one feature in which they excelled. Cicero settles this point. "We did not exceed," says Cicero, speaking for his countrymen, "the Spaniards in numbers, nor did we excel the Gauls in strength of body, nor the Carthaginians in craft, nor the Greeks in arts and science, but we have indisputably surpassed all the nations of the universe in piety and attachment to religion."

The same is true of Greece. There the hearth, the tombstone, and the altar were most sacred things, and the inspirations to piety and to virtue which gather around the traditions of the Holy Grove are a sufficient answer to any one who thinks that even religion can save a nation from decay, or furnish any material consolation to a people suffering from misrule. How a diversity of religions, each differing with the other, and each seeking either to master the state or to pull its influence in a special direction, can lend strength to government is more than can be comprehended. A national church was a source of strength to Greece as it is in our day to England, to Russia, to Germany, and

in Japan. The Greeks appreciated religion, so much that even their manual of cavalry management began thus: "First of all it is proper to sacrifice to the gods." Again note Euripides: "The altar of the gods is the common refuge," and Æschylus adds in his own strong and unique way:

"Better far than towers
Are altars—yea, a shield impenetrable."

In the cases of the republic of Florence and the Dutch Republic, the encroachments of religion and the desire of ecclesiastics to dominate the state engendered that condition of things which abolished liberty and concentrated power. Has this no lesson for us? Here we have churches on every alternate block, but have we religion? The Right Rev. Henry C. Potter, Bishop of New York, says the great trouble with the churches of to-day is that "they preach creeds and not Christ." This is strictly true, and for the most part our American churches are rapidly taking on the secular spirit of faction. Churches here are no longer temples of worship to God, but practical forums for debate. "Mere social clubs," Mr. Stead calls them, from the pulpits of some of which are frequently hurled the most bitter and offensive references at the ceremonies and the sentiments peculiar to the other creeds. Such is their attitude toward each other. Bishop John P. Newman, speaking before a conference of Methodist ministers in Chicago in 1889, said: "I hope, dear brethren, the day is not far distant when a foreigner will not be permitted a place in any legislature in the land," a remark which could only apply to American citizens of foreign birth.

This spirit among the churches has also taken hold of the people, and secret organizations are now in active operation in nearly every state in the Union to give force to the sentiments of Bishop Newman, and to exclude Catholics from their civil rights under the Constitution. A curious circumstance and one worthy of note in connection with this remarkable statement of Bishop Newman's, is that while he was deprecating the incursions of foreigners at Chicago, Henry Clews, the well-known banker and millionaire of New York, was sending a circular to his numerous clients in which occurs the following paragraph:

"Throw up your hats, boys, ten thousand of them [foreigners] arrived yesterday." Here we have the interests of one set of Americans in direct opposition to another, and both parties claiming that they have the good of the country at heart. The attitude of native Americans to citizens of foreign birth and the rivalry between various church factions will conclusively show that this republic is in imminent danger from its various creeds and that the boast of religious toleration is a sham. No such danger threatened Greece or Rome, and no such condition of things exists in the republics to the south of us.

Next as to general education : And here it seems to me that President Eliot is again wrong ; not, indeed, as to the value of education, upon which we are all agreed and in respect of which we are glad to accept him as an authority, but as to its effects upon government. We cannot crush the masses or restrict the earning power of a people by huge trusts and combinations of capital, and safely persist at the same time in educating them. If the policy of depriving a great number of them of the means of living by destroying production must be pursued on the one hand, then the logical course of action would be to keep them ignorant on the other. A great statesman has laid it down as an inflexible rule that you cannot educate a people and compel them to be slaves, and if we increase the measure of personal and political liberty, education is a dangerous force for governments to contend with, unless the people are employed and contented.

Unless Uncle Sam, as the saying is, can give every man a farm or employment, a condition of ignorance might not only be blissful but a blessing. The poor wouldn't then, at least, acutely feel their degradation. To engender the instincts of liberty in the people and to pauperize them at the same time is simply fatuous. Lord Macaulay treating this very subject in his review of the life and times of Barère, remarks that the inevitable effect of a combined system of popular education and discussion such as exists in London, with a government like that of St. Petersburg, "is to produce an explosion that will shake the world." In France, he tells us, "despotism and license mingled in unblessed union engendered that mighty revolution in which

the lineaments of both parents were strangely blended; the long gestation was accomplished and Europe saw with mixed hope and terror that agonizing travail and that portentous birth." Political education is not now rescuing the country from false counters and repeaters at elections, nor from the power of great corporations to own judges on the bench, or to control legislation in the Senate halls of the nation. In spite of all that political education can accomplish, we have judges as brutal as Jeffreys and as corrupt as Bacon, who peddle their decisions through partners or proxies, and who obtain a seat on the bench by they or their friends putting up money and wading through the filth and mire of politics. We have trusts and tramps; and shysters and sharpers and swindlers; and heelers and hobos and helots; and cliques and coteries and cabals, such as no nation has ever produced in the same abundance and facilities for mischief. What impression is education making on these classes? To clothe such men with the attributes of power, and to look to the slow operation of educational forces in order to check their rapacity, is to invite the same condition of things that existed in France previous to the last Convocation of the Orders. It reminds us of nothing so much as of the erection of a handsome building with a pretty façade and elaborate architecture, the basement of which was a powder magazine, and in all the interior compartments of which was stored a plentiful supply of fire-crackers.

No government has ever been changed solely through the discontent of its ignorant men. The majority of those who have figured in revolutions in the past, or whose influences have molded the events in our time, were, in the main, men of education and of resources both mental and material, far above the average of the common people. Again, it may be stated that men of education and of high moral principles never yet saved a government which the majority of its people were determined to overthrow. When the masses were aroused they invariably swept everything before them. They always found leaders, and one of the most remarkable incidents having a direct bearing upon this subject is, that during the late strike at Chicago,

thousands of men denounced the government, and there is little doubt that if labor questions again assume such an acute stage as existed last summer in Chicago the working classes will be prepared to resist the government, if it stands at the back of corporations. Anyhow, learned men cannot withstand the popular will when it once moves. Cicero's orations against Verres and Catiline did not save Rome, and the eloquence of Demosthenes or the bravery of Phocion did not preserve Greece. Cæsar was a man of as uncommon gifts of character as Patrick Henry or as Benjamin Franklin or Thomas Paine. Danton, Jean Jacques, Rousseau, and Robespierre were all men of education, and the same is true of Cromwell and of Hampden.

But, as a matter of fact, there was no such condition of ignorance in Greece or Rome as President Eliot would have us to believe, and in comparison with which he cites the superior education of this country. When the republic fell in Greece, she was as much the home of scholars as the nurse of arms. Then and for long ages before, the arts of her people had illumined the world, and tended to soften and ameliorate the manners of men. Besides, the high culture of Athens was the direct result of her public men and of her political institutions, while whatever of culture we possess and whatever measure of development the country has attained are solely due to its illimitable resources, to its unparalleled immigration, and this in spite of the corrupting influences of money on our laws and the characters of our politicians.

The education of the Roman youth began also at the mother's knee, as in the case of the brothers Gracchi and their mother Cornelia. In the days of the republic, Greek pedagogues were also quite common in Rome, and after the Roman boy had his home training, he was sent to the grammar classes, where he studied the declensions of nouns and pronouns, the conjugations of verbs, and the rules of syntax. He was specially grounded in the correct pronunciation of words and the modulations and inflections of the voice. The Roman boy afterward studied Greek from the pages of Homer and Latin from Livy, Virgil, or Horace. His other exercises embraced a miscel-

laneous course of study in which drawing, arithmetic, geometry, translations, recitation, boxing, swimming, and wrestling were included. Was this not a good enough system of education having regard to the circumstances of the time, and does any better system exist to-day? Yet, education no more than religion helped to save the Roman Republic from the prey of factions, who after they had pillaged the world then commenced pillaging one another.

Have these things no moral for us? Has human nature changed any from the days of the prophet Samuel to those of Samuel J. Tilden? Of course the proportion of people in Rome thus educated was comparatively small, as the proportion of college-bred men is also trifling in America, not numbering more than five per cent of the whole population. But education among the common people was by no means contracted at Rome, and if we are to judge of the education of Americans by that of our millionaires, who are sometimes unable to do more than write letters or sign a check, the standard of intelligence in Rome, and which proved useless to popular government, was fully equal to that existing to-day in America, where thousands of little children are at work when they should be at school, their parents being mostly too poor to keep them there.

While there is more money voted for education in America than in any other country in the world, yet the strange fact remains that the American people, taking them all in all, are not a better educated people than those of Germany or England. There children have to remain a certain number of days in each year at school and are not permitted to work in the factories under a certain standard of age. We have no right to consider ourselves a better educated people than those republics to which we are indebted for Homer, Hesiod, and Horace in poetry, for Euclid and Archimedes in science, for Lycurgus and Justinian in law, for Cicero, Sulla, and Demosthenes in eloquence, and for Plato, Aristotle, and Pythagoras in philosophy. The character of a country is always judged of not by its ignorant but by the measure of its exalted men, and when we have improved upon those eminent models of personal virtue and of

mental attainment, it will be quite time enough for us to lull ourselves to sleep in the belief that the republic is secure through education.

The errors into which the president of Harvard College has fallen through his desire to escape the glaring symptoms of our danger extend also to the other features of his argument. For example, the means of preserving public health and physical exercise are hardly equal to the splendid system of public baths that existed in Rome, or to the measure of national amusements provided for the people in the Pyrrhic dances of Greece, or in the Olympian, the Pythian, or the Numean games. It is quite true that we have better morals than the people of the old republics, yet in the opinion of many people the conditions of life in Greece and Rome were more conducive to the unity of family life than our system of life in boarding houses, hotels, and flats. When we remember that in New York City, out of a population of 1,800,000, no less a number than 1,300,000 people, in round numbers, live in tenement flats, the injurious effect of this on the health and morals of the country will be properly estimated. The flat system is not conducive to the proper isolation, training, or development of the family. It was not intended for that purpose, but designed in order to subordinate the comforts of life to the largest possible rent producing area. The flat doubtless has its advantages, but it cannot be regarded as other than a makeshift, and never secures the enjoyment or the seclusion of a home.

Professor Eliot dwells hopefully upon the independence of woman in America, and thinks that her social emancipation from the bondage of ancient times, and the fact of her being made a sharer in her husband's property will be highly advantageous in safeguarding the republic. The American woman is fairly entitled to the position she has won, both in the professions and in the home. Much faith may be entertained of her possibilities and an implicit belief in her good sense and personal charms. If this republic had been during the past ten years under the political control of woman as it has been at the mercy of American men, I am satisfied that President Eliot

would not need to give us assurance of its future. Yet viewing the argument which he presents to us in respect of the rights of woman, I am equally satisfied that her position has its drawbacks. The principal of these is the surprising facilities afforded by our courts whereby a man may, after spoiling a woman's chances in life, shake her off as fancy, caprice, or self-interest dictates. In fact, the emancipation of woman in many cases has come to this, that she holds the charter of her freedom subject to the espionage of servants, to the greed of a divorce lawyer and paid detectives, and to revision of the marriage contract by a judge put into office by cliques of politicians, among whom the lawyer and the detective are supreme.

Marriage in this republic is by no means a permanent institution. It is, on the contrary, very much of a bargain, into which both people enter and from which either may be absolved with little difficulty and no loss of prestige or social reputation whatever. The machinery for the dissolution of marriage has been so corrupted through the decisions of the courts and the shrewdness of divorce lawyers, that those who find the duties or obligations of the marriage state inconvenient, need only commit some of the offenses against virtue or morality (and they need not do that if they wish to reside in some of the western states for ninety days), so as to bring them within the statute covering legal separation. The records of the divorce courts in Dakota or in Rhode Island are silent but eloquent witnesses of the extent to which woman has been emancipated in America, in contrast with her European sister. This divorce business and its consequent disruption of family ties are having a most deplorable effect upon the life and morals of the nation. It is dishonest toward woman, detrimental to man's well-being, and prolific of a whole circle of national misfortunes, which are sure to tell as the years roll on.

The shrewd American girl, judging by the frequent marriages of American heiresses with foreigners, does not take President Eliot's serene view of her emancipation. Within the past five or ten years the number of American girls who spurn the conditions imposed upon them by the divorce laws of America is

so great that the American business man will in the future find it as difficult to get a wife in his own class as a Dakota farmer or a rancher in Montana. Many independent American girls, who are masters of their own destinies and dowry, will go to Europe for a husband, and it is the most intelligent and sagacious of our girls who are doing so now. It is often said by her critics that the American girl is after a title; that she is captivated by the airs and the agreeable manners of English gentlemen; and in far the majority of cases she is after a home, a natural and humane protector, and the prospect of an undisturbed and permanent independence. The number of marriages of American girls is remarkable for being in the inverse ratio of those women of foreign birth who marry American gentlemen. This indicates very plainly that neither at home nor abroad are the conditions of woman's emancipation so thoroughly appreciated by women, who are after all the best judges of the matter which so closely concerns their lives, as to bear out the representations of President Eliot regarding the stability of government through either American morals or family life.

The power and influence of woman have never been as great in a republic as in a monarchy, and woman herself knows it. A court and its environments have always had a supreme attraction for women, and their refinement and advancement have also always reacted favorably upon men and nations. If the American woman were a free agent to-morrow, and could exercise her legitimate and proper influence here, we would have a court which would promote a high standard of dignity and honor in all public and political affairs, and I think this is so obviously true that President Eliot seems to me a trifle absurd in counting woman as a supporter of a republic which reduces everything to a dead level of mediocrity, and outside the range of which every woman of real independence, like every gentleman of wealth, including Mr. Astor, is casting her lot for the future.

Nor has the republic much in my opinion to hope for from the happy relations and the interdependence of classes. In countries where the wealthy classes and their retainers have lived together for generations, such might be the case. What mutual depend-

ence between man and man as described by President Eliot could exist, for example, between George M. Pullman and his employees? They did not know each other before they assumed the relations of master and man and since they have become acquainted they have not esteemed each other; the relations between both being a mere matter of money; the functions of the employer being to get all the work he possibly could out of the servant and that of the latter to perform his work and draw his pay. This is essentially a country where every man is for himself. The relations of classes in America is also well illustrated in the case of Mr. Andrew Carnegie, who had employed certain men in his armor-plate works at Pittsburg. A certain amount of confidence was placed in those men, which they took special pains to violate, but, as the results showed, with much loss to Mr. Carnegie's business and corresponding advantage to the state. If President Eliot's ideas of mutual dependence between classes had any force, the feudal system of the Middle Ages would still exist, for that was an ideal state of dependence, the peasant being essential to the peer, and the latter, whether on the battlefield or in parliament, holding his influence in proportion to the number and the loyalty of his retainers. Surely this condition of servitude is foreign to the nature and permanency of a republic.

As to corporation service, we cannot doubt that large aggregations of capital have developed private enterprises and wonderfully advanced this country beyond others, particularly in the field of manufactures and of transportation. If corporations were to make intelligent use of their privileges, if they were to faithfully discharge their duties to the state and deal out justice to their people, the republic would surely be sustained, but who expects corporations to do this? The history of corporations in America is one distressing story of unmitigated greed. Nobody hopes to change the character of corporations or to see them respect their obligations, either to the state or to the people. There is greater danger, therefore, to the republic from those corporations than there is to any organized interest in the country, not excepting the church factions and the politicians.

When legislation was so favorable to corporations that three or four men, not with a capital of \$100,000, but with a credit for that amount, which is a vastly different thing, could form a company and go to the United States Treasury for permission to start a bank, or to the state legislatures to construct a railroad, and who on the strength of this concession could issue bonds, squeeze the purchasers, and pocket millions without the outlay of a single dollar of their own money, then surely the nursing of corporations was carried far enough for the health and stability of the nation. Herein lies a real danger, for if there be one thing more than another upon which the people are agreed, it is that in future the wings of corporations will be clipped considerably. During the past year or two we have seen several of those banks go to the wall, and most of the great trunk lines of railroads so built are in the hands of receivers. The people of the states through which they have passed have been burdened with exactions, the shareholders are not enriched because the property of the roads themselves is bankrupt, and no one save the executive officers and stock manipulators seem to have grown rich.

Heretofore concessions have been voted to large corporations in violation of the plainest rights of the people, and by corrupt politicians who were well paid for their betrayal of popular rights, and who having once tasted blood, are very likely to continue their blackmailing tactics in the future. The corporations are no longer able to respond to their demands; there are now far too many national banks and railroads in the country to do a profitable business either in currency or transportation. Besides, the people appear to have "caught on" to the methods of the banks and railroads as well as to those of other corporate interests and of great trusts. When the truth becomes fully known, when the people discover how they were cheated while they slept, when the field of pillage is circumscribed, those very corporations nursed by the state under such a liberal system of legislation as was never before duplicated in any country, they will be the first to demand a change, because a change of government will be their only security. Then will

come the crash. It is almost upon us now and will become more manifest as Populistic legislation develops itself. The Populist party is the entering wedge and to all appearances that party has come to stay.

There remains the question of the liberty of the press, and upon this subject President Eliot is entirely right. It is in the terror of evildoers inspired by the press that lies the principal safeguard of the republic. The press, of all the forces of modern civilization, is the one element of strength which we possess that the ancient republicans did not enjoy. In the main, the press of America has been faithful to its trust and vigilant in defense of popular liberty. The newspapers ferret out crime, they sometimes force the police to double their energy in pursuit of criminals and effectually expose them when they fail to do so. The light of publicity and the fear of exposure is a terrible deterrent to evildoers; but what can the press do more? In England and in other constitutionally governed countries, the publication of official malfeasance bears directly upon Parliament. A newspaper article read or commented upon in the House of Commons would have caused the prompt dismissal, for example, of Chief John Y. McKane of Gravesend. Here it took weeks and months of activity on the part of the press before even public attention was riveted upon McKane's misdeeds. Even then he scornfully defied public opinion, and it was only by a special effort on the part of the citizens, by prayer, remonstrance, and petition, by public meetings, and by abundant subscriptions in money that the state was eventually aroused to the point of action. The proper legal officer, whose business it was to prosecute crime, had to be set aside before the machinery of justice could be brought to bear upon this notorious criminal who insolently snapped his fingers and declared himself above the law and judicial injunctions. A special grand jury had also to be impaneled, and eminent and expensive lawyers retained, and even then the "Boss of Gravesend" was only convicted by an accident. What can the press do unaided and alone to preserve the republic in the face of circumstances like those? Newspapers after all are private

enterprises and cannot be expected to act their own part as well as that of the policeman and of the state prosecutor.

In a busy country like this life is too short and our occupations too engrossing to justify the American citizen thus spending his energies in stimulating incompetent officials who are paid liberally to enforce the criminal laws. And as there seems no practical way by which public officers when once appointed can be forced to discharge their duties if they are unwilling to do so, or removed from office, the people here are just as likely to take a short and summary method of ending the agonies of society as they did in all the other republics of antiquity. They are even more likely; the American citizen when he moves, moves with a vengeance that is swift, sure, and phenomenal. He sees pretty plainly that a constitution slow in operation and made over a century ago for thirteen colonies on the eastern seaboard of the country for the government of 3,600,000 people is unable to meet the requirements of a vast empire and a population twenty times larger. Already the people object to the checks and balances and the difficulty of changing laws through a cumbersome and inflexible constitution. They are demanding the direct election of senators by the people, the abolition of the electoral college, and other changes which mean a great deal when considered in connection with the permanency of American institutions.

Happily the flag of this Union yet stands for the liberties of mankind, and however the people condemn their legislatures of to-day, they cherish the memories of the Fathers of the Republic. But there lurks a real danger in the contamination of citizenship in the corruption of public life, in the indifference and apathy of the people, in the growth of factions, secular, political, and clerical, and on the whole a mortal disease seems to have settled down upon the nation to such an extent that were it not for the vigilance of the American press and the liberties guaranteed by a ballot law which was borrowed from an English colony, this republic might not even have existed unto this day.

T. BURKE GRANT.

LEGISLATURES: A DEFENSE AND A CRITICISM.

BY RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN.

THE Senate of the United States, by its censurable failure to establish rules to enable it to transact business, has fallen greatly in popular respect. Complaint of the dishonesty and incapacity of state legislatures is growing louder and more frequent in recent years, and the people, as a whole, have less and less respect for the men elected by them, from their own number, to the legislatures and to Congress. Much that is said is deserved. Much of the criticism, however, is ignorant or flip-pant. The evils are great enough without magnifying them, and the consequences of widespread and undeserved condemnation of the legislatures are liable to be serious. As far as the condemnation is undeserved, it should cease upon a better understanding of facts. As far as it is deserved, let it be intelligent and critical in order that the evils may be remedied. Mr. Moorfield Storey, in his recent paper before the American Bar Association, rightly said that loss of faith in the legislature was loss of faith in representative government and loss of faith in the people themselves.

A legislature is the highest embodiment of overruling force or fate which men know, and it is worthy of the defense of a true statement, while, at the same time, it needs severe criticism. In the first place, it is the truth that the legislature, though a representative body, is possessed of higher intelligence, on the average, than the people whom it represents. Disputed as this proposition often is by the cynical and pessimistic students of political affairs, questionable as it may seem at times when the law-making body has provoked a particularly severe storm of public condemnation, yet it is a truth which will demonstrate itself to the candid observer. Though it may be asserted that the people cannot choose representatives of higher average intelli-

gence and virtue than themselves, yet the answer, true and complete, is that a human mind can recognize qualities in others superior to the same qualities in itself. A mind of some information knows a mind of larger information when brought in contact with it. One with a certain breadth and accuracy of judgment recognizes the broader and more accurate judgment of a more finely trained man. One with a certain facility in reaching a decision is sure at times that others come to an equally correct conclusion with greater promptness and less liability to err. One with a certain persistence in will acknowledges a stronger will when in its presence. These things are all true and it is strange doctrine, advanced nowhere else than in attacks upon representative government, that a mind does not know when it meets a superior.

But if a theoretical demonstration of the relative superiority of the average legislator over the average citizen is not accepted as conclusive, then let the doubter make careful observation of fact. No better place for this observation can be found than in the town-meeting. Go to one of the annual gatherings of Massachusetts freemen for the dispatch of municipal business and watch for the men who are most influential in the town's affairs, the men who take the most active part, who bear the most responsibility, whose opinions weigh most with the large majority of silent men who vote but do not speak. Only one candid conclusion can follow such a test. It is the men who have been to the legislature, they and their peers, men of the same grade of honesty and capacity, who manage the town's affairs.

In regard to city members of the legislature, while the town-meeting test is not applicable, yet it is true of them that, as a whole, they are the men most interested in public affairs, of most prominence in the primary meetings, and of more weight in the discussion of public questions than the average voter. However far the legislative standard may fall below the ideal, and however higher it might be made by more careful selection of men who are available, it yet remains that representative government does get a better class of men for the legislature than the average. This must be ever borne in mind during all

the criticisms which are justly passed upon legislative bodies, some of which properly find a place in the observations which follow.

It is common and easy to abuse the legislature. Many people seem to think that the members are an exceptionally poor lot of ignorant, selfish, and corrupt men, incompetent to deal with public affairs and with their hands always held behind them to receive bribes. Now, in the sense that public affairs are greater than any one comprehends and that the broad settlement of problems which arise in legislatures requires higher mental ability than any men can bring to the solution, it is true that legislatures are incompetent for their duties. But that is a fault common to all men in all kinds of business who have responsibility of management, and hence the legislature is not thereby rightfully subject to popular criticism.

Again, while venality doubtless exists in the legislature, it is the brightness of the light which is constantly turned upon the members, and the sensitiveness of the people to wrong-doing by their representatives which leads to so much healthful agitation against legislative corruption. Upon this one point the public attention is focused and every one is suspicious, but it is a fair question (which men familiar with the practices of trade and with the tricks and charges of professional men, mechanics, and laboring men to beat an extra dollar out of their customers may answer) whether the entire mass of business is not permeated by a greater degree of misrepresentation, fraud, intimidation, and corruption than prevails in the legislature and whether the existence in the legislature of what the people condemn is not merely a manifestation of what the people themselves practice.

In one aspect of the matter, it is the fact that the legislature is the embodiment of supreme force in human affairs which exposes it to wrath and denunciation. The legislature cannot strike back at its critics. Its members are citizens among the common people in the daily walks of life. If they are slandered and defamed in their private capacity they have abundant remedy at law, and he must beware who would attack them thus without due warrant of fact and without sufficient provocation.

But in their public capacity they are tied. Slanders may be heaped upon them without any justification, in fact, and they have no remedy. They embody what is hateful to many men and is irksome, at least, to most—law. Hence all who are restless under law can relieve their restlessness under restraint by attacks upon the lawmakers. The bigger the thing which is attacked with impunity, the greater the sense of power and self-importance in him who attacks. By long experience the people know that it is perfectly safe to say all manner of slanderous things of the legislature, and by long enjoyment of it they have come to take great pleasure in doing it. Fate may compel to obedience of law, but fate cannot prevent the victims of law from turning around and expressing their uncompromising opinions of the lawmakers.

But my defense of the legislature against excessive popular criticism by no means overlooks the fair strictures which may be passed upon the body as a whole and upon its members individually. Certainly legislative methods can be improved, speaking of the motions of the body as a parliamentary machine. Abundant room exists for improvement in the quality of the legislators even though they are already above the average of the people. The state has in it men who can render better service than is now given, and it is the fault of the people who criticise the legislature that they do not get better men. Speaking particularly of the Massachusetts legislature and comparing the present with a generation ago, it can be seen that not as many leading men are elected as formerly. This is more markedly true of the cities than of the towns, because the city councils furnish stepping-stones to the young men who are ambitious to shine in politics, and, having once begun to climb the ladder, they want hasty promotion to the higher places. Many recent city members have been young men who have served in the local government and have been at once, or after only a brief interval, elected to the legislature. They want to be elected. They are either "estimable young men" whom the elder voters are willing to see complimented, or are politicians who "lay in with the boys" and so secure the

election. But with many of them their judgment and experience are yet in the gristle, and it would be better, if their constituents wish to compliment them, to issue a certificate of satisfactory public service upon their graduating from the local board of aldermen and then to elect the experienced business men of the city to the legislature, than it would be to use a really high and unappreciated public office as a coin for the payment of a political debt, or as a medal in token of public compliment.

The fault in the rural districts is of a different sort, but it is also very injurious to the efficacy of the legislature. In Massachusetts several towns are united in one district. A redistricting, in order to preserve the balance of representation with population, occurs in every year following a state census, that is, in every year ending in "6." Immediately following a redistricting, it is the practice in many districts for the managing politicians of the towns to meet and decide for how many of the coming ten years each town is entitled to have the representative. The schedule having been laid down, it is carried out as closely as the mutations and casualties of politics will permit, regardless of the fitness of the representative who is set aside after only one year of service and of the unfitness of the man who wishes to succeed him. Many men covet the honor of representing the district. They have no doubt that they are as capable as most men who go to the General Court. If they are not given their turn, there will be bitterness, and the party slate may be broken. Hence the understandings and bargains are carried out. Politicians in adjacent towns, who expect their turn to come soon, help the one whose turn it is to have his one year of service. They help him in and they help him out, and so the honors are passed around, while the state is continually suffering at the hands of inexperienced men who have ability to serve better in a second year, were the state permitted to have the benefit of their experience. In the case of both city and country, it is seen, inordinate personal ambition is allowed to play with the welfare of the state and the people do not prevent it.

The high quality of the service which is needed in this body is not appreciated by many constituencies. It is not an uncommon thing for men to be sent to the legislature because they have been financially unfortunate and the salary will be a material help to them, and it is not an unknown thing that a man has been elected in order that he may draw money from the state treasury and thus not become a public charge upon the treasury of the town he represented. If the people elect men whom they know to be not the best, it is only natural that to that degree the legislature should fail to command popular respect, but the blame is on the electors, not on the men who are elected.

In the second place, we have to consider what forces seek to influence the action of the legislature. Consider the situation for a moment, and see how the legislature stands at the very focus of the selfish forces which would use the tremendous power of the entire social body for the support of their personal ambitions for wealth or power, and of the selfishly-patriotic people who want the public peace preserved in order that their slumbers may not be disturbed and that their property may not be destroyed. The sheep-hunting dog always flies at the throat of his victim because it is the vital part, and so many forces hostile to the state are felt at the legislature, in time of peace, as far as they dare to appear. Raids upon the public treasury, either by contracts or by salaries, must be through the legislature. If questionable financial schemes can get the indorsement of the state, their promoters may realize great or sudden wealth. It is only as the legislature is expected to be hostile that the worst schemes for public plunder are held in check. Let the hand of repression be relaxed, as the hand of governmental force was relaxed in the Pittsburg riots of 1877, and there would be seen another such outbreak of hostile hordes as then pillaged, burned, and murdered. Furthermore, even among people who consider themselves upright, there is a readiness to use the state for selfish purposes which needs constant repression. Besides these unworthy schemers for legislative favor, many people need legitimate legislation, and

they constitute by far the larger portion of the petitioners. Pressure from all sorts of persons, appeals to all sorts of motives, importunity, argument, threat of political consequences, and baser inducements, in violation of law, these are the forces which are added to the merits of the question to compel a favorable result. It is easily seen that justice may often be in peril.

In the third place, one ground of assurance in the legislature is in the better ability of the branches than of the average citizen to pass upon the merits of issues under discussion, and it is to be observed here, incidentally, that the advantage of the referendum which has recently been proposed is more particularly in the possibility of getting an unbiased or uninfluenced judgment than in getting a judgment of wider intellectual grasp. As a modern legislature is constituted, at least with a large House like that of Massachusetts with 240 members, it doubtless has the intellectual capacity to pass upon a proposition more correctly than has the mass of the voters. It is the real and constant danger of undue influence upon legislation which may make a popular vote more true to the interests of the entire people than a legislative enactment.

Further assurance is in the history of legislatures. Admitting many mistakes, many displays of partisan injustice which must make the judicious grieve, many questionable favors granted, many suspicious acts done, yet, as a broad truth, these men of the past have builded wiser than they knew. Legislation is, in the main, a hand to mouth process. Statesmen there doubtless are, of more or less prophetic vision into the future, with more or less comprehension of broad principles involved, and with more or less approach to perfect unselfishness in action, in every legislature, men who serve the public far better than the public ever knows, but for the most part laws are made with only a short sight into the future. As a man eats because he is hungry, so laws are enacted because the political body has immediate need of them. And the fitness of the food to satisfy the hunger and the efficacy of the laws to meet the wants of the petitioners are each a proof that there is an organism the nature of whose development is revealed in this way and whose good is to be

thus promoted. Hence comes an assurance that these legislators, the embodiment of the force which is constantly carrying the human race forward to a development higher than the past and broader than the ideas of men, will do what is right for the body politic as a whole. Though they may consciously satisfy only the temporary hunger, yet that satisfaction is the means of present comfort and the basis of future growth.

Amid the just and unjust criticisms of the legislature, there is need of a better popular appreciation of its true function and of its genuine high rank among the powers which make or mar the happiness of the people. Though the legislature is better than the popular idea of it, yet it should be better than it is. No fault can be found in the body itself, as a part of the political machinery of the people, that its functions are not worthy of the highest talent which the state can produce, or that its powers are not great enough for the ample exercise of any human capacity, or that its responsibilities are not heavy enough for the most trustworthy citizen. Neither the function of the legislature as a political factor, nor its opportunities for the exercise of high political talent, nor its intimate connection with the development of the body politic are appreciated by the people as a whole. It is to the discredit of the people that they fail to rise to the standard of appreciation and to the noble demand for service which are the due of the lawmaking body. In the very nature of the case, above the will of man, is the law of the well-being of the state. To attain a right conception of this law and to put it in practice is the noblest service any man can render his fellows. There stands the legislature, created, in so far as men recognize the laws above them, by a will above the human will, an unconscious embodiment of that will, in so far as it is composed of individual human wills, in an attitude of obedience to the good of the state, a body above which there is nothing on earth to control its constitutional action, most honorable in its place in the reign of law and order, most important in its service, most dignified in its acts, most necessary to the good of every person in the state. To the institution, as such, too great honor will never be paid, however much we may condemn the

individuals of any particular year. Too lofty a conception cannot be held of what it ought to be in its relation to the people. How much, then, are the voters unworthy of the good they might get from it who pursue the almighty dollar during the entire year, except an hour on election day (and many do not give even that hour), and have little thought of the exalted character and function of that body to which they elect the members? How inevitable is it that with a legislature elected with so little of appreciation beforehand, there should be so little of appreciation afterward, and that what has been made with contemptuous disregard of its lofty worth should be treated with contempt after its work is done?

Perhaps it is natural that the popular mind has not yet recognized the exceptionally high and honorable function of the legislature, because we have not reached the point of appreciation in our political development. Reverence is not a common sentiment entertained toward Congress or parliament or legislature. Contempt and denunciation are far more frequently expressed. Naturally this is so. Legislative bodies in monarchical countries, where the representatives do not express freely in law the will of the people, but are opposed by a monarch, do not, in fact, have the high function of legislative bodies in the United States. Legislative positions which are hereditary can never be held in genuine popular esteem among people who are capable of electing their own representatives. Government for the most part in the world's history has not been by the people for the people. Hence by tradition and by circumstance we are not trained to a proper appreciation of the legislative office. The people do not have a sufficiently high ideal by which to choose their representatives. The representatives do not have a sufficiently high standard by which to exalt their service. But, unless we have reached the turning-point and are already retrograding in political force and honesty, people and press will demand a better class of legislators and will insist upon the state's having the best of ability, character, and experience, regardless of local ambitions, while the legislators themselves, with a higher ideal of statesmanship, will work with broader and

more prophetic vision for the good of the commonwealth.

With all the legislature's failings in capacity and with all its sins of corruption, of moral weakness, and of untrustworthiness, there it is with no superior (as it is the representative of a sovereign people). It is the mediator between the unseen, supreme laws which control all political development and the people, whose prosperity depends upon its faithfulness in comprehending and expressing those laws. There it stands, the embodiment of the mysterious forces, as far as any human institution can embody them, which from the distant centuries of the past, through the intervening years of fateful history, and into the unknown future, sweep humanity along to a destiny as mysterious as the forces themselves. No political institution is of higher worth or in need of more faithful honor by the people than the lawmaking body. Upon the people, then, must be the shame if the legislature falls below the ideal standard. Theirs must be the penalty if it fails in its duty to them, and theirs will be the gain if, by a resolute reform in their practices, they exalt this institution to its really high position by securing the services of the best men in the state and by defeating all unworthy ambition which would use the legislative office as a social honor or as a prize for selfish politicians.

RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN.

THE BURDEN OF INDISCRIMINATE IMMIGRATION.

BY JULIA H. TWELLS.

THE terribly justifiable words of Peter the Great upon his country, "Russia is rotting before she is ripe," threatens to be applicable, with almost as much accuracy, to our future America.

Posterity appears to be forgotten! All true patriotism, all pride and love for the youngest and most promising region of the civilized world seems lacking among its people! There is little thought of the future, or ambition for the moral, physical, and spiritual growth of the people; all is ignored and lost beneath the feverish glamour of individual greed and a selfish desire for power through wealth!

In this enlightened age there is no excuse for a deterioration of race; America has the enriched pages of history to teach her wherein lies a country's danger, and how, by ignoring certain simple precautions, the strongest and most powerful empires have suffered utter destruction, and their peoples have been scattered promiscuously over the face of the earth.

Although America can boast advantages which few, if any, known country has been favored with, what sort of a people is she raising to herself? A mongrel lot, gathered, for the most part, from the indiscriminate and corrupt superflux of other countries.

Unrestricted immigration acts slowly upon a people, like the oozing leak of a sewer pipe into the crystal waters of a well, and it is well known by medical authorities that the importation of such diseases as rickets and affections of the eyes, through the immigration of lower Italians, Sicilians, and Russian Jews, has created a great increase of these diseases among lower classes of Americans; and that, by intermarriage with such foreign rotteness, our original stock is deteriorated.

"The mulatto," says a well-known medical professor of Pennsylvania, "is peculiarly susceptible to disease and shows but little vitality, and the mortality from any affection from which they may suffer is much greater than when the same disease occurs in the pure African or Caucasian; and the disease which produces the greatest mortality among them is pulmonary consumption, which runs a peculiarly rapid, fatal course, and not infrequently death occurs in a single year. To the eye they present the appearance of good health, and develop earlier than those descended from either race, but this is deceptive, and their vitality is much less. Catarrhal troubles are frequent, and rickets is very common. Strangely enough this class is very fertile, and large families, numbering ten, twelve, or more, are not unusual."

Civilization has narrowed the current of local thought in America to selfish channels of individual and present comfort; little heed is given, even by those upon whom rests the welfare of the people, to the future; all is hurry and struggle for what each can grasp and hold for his own.

Business men care little for the means by which they obtain their hoarded gold, nor stop to think at what cost to their country and countrymen; they hire the riffraff of other lands because they can get them at a less cost than Americans.

There is a disgusting undercurrent of niggardly parsimony and avarice in the mild way in which the United States has received, for years, the scum of the populated world into their harbors, and set them in the fallow fields of employed contentment, while thousands of American-born and capable men seek work in vain. There is scarcely one great manufacturing company in the United States whose employees are not at least one third foreign. Are they better workmen? No; they are cheaper. Oh, potent argument!

But there is the hint of an even more revolting undercurrent, brought to sensitive nostrils, as one probes deeper into the importation of these alien outcasts; are they not so many more voters? and, being what they are, of the lowest and vilest class, are they not easily corrupted to the advantage of any individual

man or party? They are given voting privileges without much supervision, and are therefore politically important!

To this fact, perhaps, may be attributed the extraordinary un-American attitude of Governor Altgeld of Illinois during the recent railway strikes, and also the unpatriotic resolution offered by Senator Kyle, and supported by Senators Allen and Pepper, with the object of morally supporting the strikers in their lawlessness. As an American must live in the United States twenty-one years before he is allowed to vote, adult foreign-born residents should be compelled to live at least five years in this country before the privilege of voting is granted them, which privilege should be withheld if, during that time, proof exists that they are not good citizens. "A good citizen should be as solicitous about the public as a bee is about his hive," says Cato, and what truer words were ever spoken?

Upon the individual rests the condition of a people and the prosperity of a country. No high civilization can endure save where the people are actuated by strong morality and a zealous love of their country. It was mostly owing to a corrupt few that Babylon, Troy, Tyre, and Rome fell to ruin, and are now passing away into fiction.

As one calls to mind some incidents of our immediate history, one is forced to recognize the galling truth of Mr. W. T. Stead's words, "The great mischief in America is the absence of trust, the rooted disbelief in the honesty or faith of any one." Can anything express underlying corruption more fully?

There is no true patriotic zeal in America, and how can it be expected, when nearly two thirds of the people are goldseekers from other countries? when many of our very highest men are those whose reason for being here is a selfish desire to better their condition, not love for the country?

Our foreign appointments alone are sufficient proof of the utter lack of patriotic pride among our people. Posts are given to indiscriminate and unqualified men, as rewards, generally, for ignoble political assistance, and the United States is represented in nearly all parts of Europe by ill-bred and oft-times illiterate men, who are not even Americans; who fill the place of gentle-

men and patriots, an undisguised proof of bribery and corruption.

Those forcible words of Farrar come to our minds as we view the present politics of the United States, "How little we see in life in accordance with the dignity of one whom God's hand crowned with the diadem of honor—man!" How little, indeed, is there to be found to do honor to our country, if one should investigate into the true state of things! Is there dignity in allowing an influx of international filth to enter this country year after year, because it swells the number of votes or because steamship companies benefit, or labor is obtained a little cheaper for the few? In Chicago alone the foreign element of the population numbers fifty-one per cent, and in the late Pullman labor troubles there, all the outrages committed, such as burning of cars and attempts upon human life, were owing to the wretched class of outlaw immigrants employed.

"Before emigration assumed any such proportions as it has now," says Mr. Charles Lawrence, superintendent of the Blackley Almshouse, "tramps were unknown; employers and employees were contented, and strikes were a very great rarity, and the young men were learning some mechanical trade to fit them to become useful citizens."

And again he says: "All kinds of organizations and societies have been formed and controlled by foreigners, and resolutions have been passed which prevent the American youth learning a trade, and the result is seen in the number of young men now in the prisons and almshouses."

The burden which indiscriminate immigration is imposing upon the United States is being felt more heavily every day; each year the industrial depression becomes more horrible. The pressure of competition among the number who seek employment in order to obtain their daily bread, is such that thousands of our own and capable men are crowded out to make way for men who have no just claim upon the country, and are doubtless absent from their own country for that country's good.

Having lived for some years near the emigration port of Naples, I have had ample opportunity to study the class of peo-

ple who are shipped, like cattle, by thousands yearly to this country, and it was there that I first appreciated the influx of vitiated, depraved, and diseased outcasts who were mingling promiscuously with the people of America. Although the immigration system, so far as physical condition is concerned, is carried out under far stricter laws now than formerly, still there is much deception, and the moral character and origin and purpose of the immigrants is slurred over. Scarcely one out of a shipload can write his own name or speak his language correctly; all, with the exception of very young children and a woman or two, have the appearance of undisciplined barbarism, or the hang-dog, desperate expression of escaped convicts. At times I addressed some of them, and asked them about their plans, and why they were leaving Italy. Two of these conversations were inimitably expressive of the truth. One was with a young Neapolitan peasant woman, who was seated upon a bundle of clothes, done up in a dirty looking shawl, which, with a much-abused hamper and a smaller home-made basket, composed her luggage. In her arms she held a very young, dirty, and sickly looking baby, and at her feet four other children, equally dirty and unhealthy looking, sprawled over each other; one, the eldest, sat a little way apart chewing a lemon-rind. I had been watching the woman for some time, having been attracted by the unhappy expression of the pale and evidently prematurely aged face. When I drew near she did not notice me, and I had to speak twice before attracting her attention.

"Is your baby ill?" I asked gently in Italian.

"Ah, yes, signora," she replied, looking up without a change of expression. "She has been ill very long; they have all been ill and I, too."

"You look ill, my poor woman," I said. "Are you not afraid to take this long journey with so many little ones and you so weak?"

"Ah, no, everything will be all right when we get to America; there we shall have food and a home; we have been half starved lately, for we were saving the money to take us over; we

had to borrow fifty francs from my father, but my husband has promised to send him sixty from America."

"Is any of your family over there?" I asked.

"No, but we have some friends who came back last winter with much, much money."

"Has your husband sufficient capital to start a business upon?" I asked, led on by curiosity.

"He has no money," she replied, holding out her hands with characteristic gesture. "It took all to pay our passage."

"And how," I asked surprised, "does he expect you to live over there without money?"

"Oh, we won't need money when we once get over there; America is the country of gold, and there are big palaces where we can live. My friend Amalia and all her children lived in one for six months until her husband made much money, and then he took her out and brought her home to Italy."

My next conversation was with a hideous, withered-up old man, who looked more like a deformed baboon than a human being. He was seated with two other old men of about the same description.

"Why are you leaving your *bouno patria*?" I asked, addressing all three.

"Because we've no place here," was the crabbed reply from the one described.

"And what do you propose doing over there?"

"Rest and be fed till we die."*

The idea is all very beautiful, that America should pose as the sweet haven of rest and succor for all the homeless, healthless, and depraved outcasts of the world, but is it right, in the eyes of God or man, that a country should neglect her own children, and drive her young sons to desperation because these worthless usurpers have left little place for the true heirs of America? These foreign leeches who, year by year, are encouraged by their government to come over and sap out the sustenance of our people!†

* Steamship agents spread such stories to swell passenger lists; they receive a percentage on each passenger.

† Italian laborers spend or send money made in the United States to Italy.

It is only necessary to glance at the tables of any annual report of the department of charities of any one of our cities to have a proof of how many foreigners are supported by the United States. The average population of the Blockley Almshouse for the year 1892 was 3,095. Daily cost per capita for maintenance 27.78 cents; 64.47 per cent are of foreign birth. In the Philadelphia almshouse only 25.19 per cent are Philadelphians; 16.43 are from other parts of America, and the remainder, 58.28 per cent, are foreigners, composed of representatives of thirty foreign countries.

Some men and women have been inmates for forty-eight years. In the insane department, of which the daily average population of the year 1892 was 945, of which 43.87 per cent were Americans, 54.25 per cent were foreigners, and 1.89 per cent unknown. Cost of maintenance per capita daily 27.28 cents. Of those admitted in the insane department of the Philadelphia hospital for 1893, 213 were Americans and 253 foreigners. There was an increase in population in 1893 in the Philadelphia almshouse of 137 over that of 1892. The expenditures for the year were \$473,711.19. The net cost to the city of the house of correction alone, in 1893, was \$175,269.10.

When one comes to consider the enormous drain upon the country that these charitable institutions cause, and how large the number of our own needy and helpless is becoming year by year, it is horrible to realize that the diseased and oft-times wantonly idle aliens drain the alms from philanthropic rich, and overcrowd the buildings which were intended to protect and shelter the poor of America. The annual report of the Department of Charities and Corrections of Philadelphia for 1893 is full of complaints of overcrowded wards and not sufficient room.

The money appropriated for the support of Blockley Almshouse is a tax assessed upon every taxpayer, and is not bestowed gratuitously; therefore, we who pay the tax are pardonable in making an effort to prevent impostors being admitted and supported by the taxpayers.

Dr. Judson Daland, of Philadelphia, while stationed at Swin-

burne Island, in 1892, had an opportunity of observing the immigrants that came over in a large number of vessels that were detained in New York harbor under quarantine. He says:

"They were mostly Russian Polish Jews and filthy beyond description, frequently covered with vermin. They seemed more like animals than human beings, and appeared to possess no desire for personal cleanliness. Their ignorance was profound. When they discovered that they could secure good food and attention in the hospital, they complained of symptoms that were not present, and when perfectly well would insist that they were ill, so as to secure these advantages. These immigrants were accompanied by many children, most of whom were thin, puny creatures. Many were deformed by a disease of the bone known as rickets; all were anæmic, and most of them suffered from nasal catarrh. An epidemic of measles occurred among them. Measles, ordinarily, causes not less than five per cent mortality, but eighty per cent of these miserable creatures perished."

The nature of these immigrants is very often lacking the common instincts of decency, and is not rarely utterly devoid of that natural maternal affection which exists even in the most savage beasts. An incident witnessed by Dr. Daland at New York harbor will illustrate this. A mother had three children, the youngest of whom died with cholera. A second mother died of the same disease, leaving a child of precisely the same age as that lost by the first mother, and naturally the bereaved woman was asked to care for the little orphan. She obstinately refused, saying she had enough to do to attend to the two children left her without troubling about those of another, but when she was offered money she willingly accepted the charge.

There is a place at a short distance from Naples where Italians of the lower classes take their new-born babies and have their bones broken and twisted horribly, so that, when they grow older, they are loathsomely and pitiablely deformed. Many hundreds of these contorted wretches have been shipped to the United States, and are now disfiguring our beautiful streets, and acting as eye-sores to the people.

Why should the American people suffer in this way through the selfish and unpatriotic greed of the steamship companies who are in league with the immigrants? There is no doubt that immigration is an advantage to the steamship companies; this being so, it is manifestly absurd that the chief commissioner of immigration stationed at New York should, in any way, be connected with the steamship companies, as is now the case. Such an office should be intrusted to a native-born American.

The laxity of the laws of the United States on these points is fully recognized by foreign countries, and for many years, when the laws were even less severe than now, they have converted this country into a drainage sewer to relieve their own cities of such incumbrances as the decrepit, the insane, the imbeciles, and criminals.

From 1882 to 1890 the decrease of desirable immigrants was more than fifty per cent, and the increase of *undesirable* immigration between 1882 and 1890 was more than ninety-five per cent.

While in Germany Dr. Daland heard a celebrated professor of nervous diseases deliver a lecture upon an imbecilic boy of eighteen. The boy was totally unable to care for himself, and the question was raised as to what should be done with him. The government makes no provision for such cases, and so it was arranged, as was the usual custom, to place the boy on board a vessel and ship him to the United States. This was before immigration was restricted as much as it is now.

An extract from the *London Times* of 1889 says: "The Prisoners' Aid Society assists convicts to emigrate, and probably the United States receives its full quota of the persons so aided."

There is one powerful clause that should be added to the laws of immigration, and that is that no person should enter the United States who cannot read and write. This will lower immensely the amount of gain to steamship companies undoubtedly, but what matter when one realizes how much ignorance and moral as well as literal filth it will keep out of the country? "Money is not essential," says Emerson, "but this wide affinity is, which transcends the habits of cliques and casts, and makes itself felt."

JULIA H. TWELLS.

A PRACTICAL EXAMPLE IN CIVICS.

BY THOMAS W. HASKINS, D.D.

ARCHIMEDES is reported to have said, "Give me a *pou sto*, a place to stand and fix my lever, and I will move the earth." What is true in mechanics is true in civics. To make theories of civic reform effective there must be a practical example. The power to work reform must rest on a separate moral foundation. Tammany cannot reform itself any more than a man can raise himself by his suspenders. Nor can any man, however pure his motives or righteous his resolves, work such reforms with Tammany back of him. The same principle may be carried to all political reform. There must be a concrete example which has a moral standing ground of its own. Though civics are distinct from morals (inasmuch as the law cannot deal with immorality until it is manifested in overt acts), yet all true civility must rest on true morality. The thoughts of the heart are the sources whence proceed all good or evil government. Examples are too numerous to need proof of the assertion that it is useless to pass good laws unless there is a moral sentiment, or a sufficiently strong physical force, back of them to enforce them. Civic reform needs Archimedes' *pou sto*.

Can such an independent standing place be had? I believe it can. Somewhere in the country we must set up concrete examples of what we are aiming to accomplish in civic reform. The air is thick with *theories* of political economy, but it is difficult to find from ocean to ocean a single community where Lincoln's church is found—love of God and love of your neighbor—as the controlling factor in business and pleasure. It is better to give known and established standards of social order a fair chance to work before trying experiments with new ones. It is true we are progressing in the refinements of civilization, in cities, but if we get off the base of the revealed social law of

God the civilization will topple over in spite of its refinement. Human rights and duties are, and must ever remain, the same in the present life of mixed good and evil, and the highest civilization is not that measured by wealth, custom, or power, but simply that which has the cleverest apprehension and the most sacred regard for the personal liberty and personal limitations of social life as revealed from heaven and planted instinctively in every human breast.

The point is to have a *distinct territory*—a separate political division—where no new theories whatever need be established or attempted, but where known and accepted standards may have a fair chance, where common honesty and civic righteousness may be set up and maintained as the standard of business, to be supported and venerated by the moral sentiment of the community. Such communities were the foundation of our country. It must be maintained by their reassertion and reestablishment.

This country has been undergoing a revolution of knowledge and sentiment in this regard of which older heads have little thought. It was manifested recently in the remark of a notary public, who had also reached the dignity of a justice of the peace, in a western town. Having taken the acknowledgment of a young man as to his descent from a soldier of the Revolutionary War, this civil officer remarked on returning the documents, "I never knew before that there was a Revolutionary War in this country."

Ignorance in this particular is significant of ignorance in other things. To some of us it would seem that a Christian might as well be ignorant of the events in Judea when Christianity came into being, as for a civil officer of our government never to have heard of the Revolutionary War. Such an exhibition ought not to be possible, but the necessity of the hour is not expressions of surprise and indignation, but searchings of heart as to how to remedy the evil.

To be still more definite, the writer may offer some practical suggestions as to how a concrete example may be furnished, in the hope that it will stimulate thought and so, at no distant day, be exhibited in action.

To begin with, for the sake of brevity, let us assume several things, which with the readers of this journal ought to have the force of axioms :

1. *I assume that existing moral ideas with regard to civic relations (which include business relations) are perilously unsatisfactory, and unless remedied will jeopardize the existence of our government.*

2. *The causes of existing and impending evil do not lie in our constitutional provisions, but in our application of them, and in our inordinate pursuit of wealth, rather than the moral and intellectual development of the producer of wealth. We worship the creature more than the creator.*

3. *Statistics prove that the disorders of the times, which may be summarized as a struggle between capital and labor, may be measured by the distance of capital from the land. This growth of evil has kept pace with the growth of cities. All confederated disorders arise from troubles with mechanics, laborers, miners, and employees, never from laborers upon, or owners of, the soil.*

4. *Among existing civic conditions three are significantly and singularly prominent, viz., idle lands, idle hands, and idle money.*

5. *The need of the hour in material things is not more money, but more commodities, and a more uniformly economic distribution of commodities whereby all people may not only share in their production but in the benefits to be derived from their production. The government cannot live on bonds, nor the people on gold. The divine provision is that people shall live by labor which produces wealth ; and a divine gift, superadded, teaches them that wealth thus produced is but a servant to enlarge their capacities and enhance their enlightenment and happiness.*

6. *The social law of God as expressed in the Ten Commandments is the unalterable constitution of divine and civil government—divine as defining the personal moral relations of the individual with God, and civil as defining the relations of men with one another, the common factor of both being love.*

7. *Therefore, love is the basic principle of both morality and civility, and the ultimate end of all law whether in church or state, in the family or in business. All civic theories and all civic practices must begin and end in love.*

These seven propositions assumed are not intended to be exhaustive of the subject even as here presented ; but suggestive and sufficient to fortify the practical example to be set forth. And love, which is here claimed to be the essential basic element of all social life, and entering as a common factor into its every fiber—labor, business, trade, commerce, politics, as well as the home and the church, is of course understood to be that divine principle implanted in man and making him thereby the offspring of God and fellow-laborer with God, to be exhibited in law and penalty as well as in liberty, forbearance, and forgiveness, not that counterfeit article, misplaced or foolish affection, or unholy lust.

THE CONCRETE EXAMPLE.

The concrete example should be the selection of a suitable territory to colonize, and establish therein an independent county government.

The unit of the social government of our country is not the city or the state, but the county. We are not so much an aggregation of states as of counties. Men's social relations are chiefly property relations, and property—wealth-producing property—is held and transferred through county government. The county constructs and controls highways, and so in a great measure gives access to land and facilitates or otherwise the distribution of its productions. As all wealth (mainly) comes from the soil, the county controls it and can establish such laws as will best promote the welfare of the people within its bounds.

In irrigation districts of the West, the county can own its water sources and construct its own reservoirs for storage and distribution. The passage of good laws can be secured and maintained with greater facility where the intelligent and righteous element can start in on virgin soil than when they have to fight for a foothold where party politics and other iniquities have gained the prestige and power of vested rights. Material assistance can be more easily secured in a well-ordered, prosperous county, settled by good people, for its bonds are sought after as attractive investments. The county is an independent factor in state government, and has a constitutional right of representation. For

these reasons new counties on virgin soil furnish Archimedes' *pou sto* for civic reform. If some professional sociologist would gather statistics and classify the data from a few of the prominent agricultural counties of the various states of the Union it would be a valuable contribution to the subject. I think the result would show that the greatest sum of happiness and prosperity will be found in those counties, not too large, and having a county town of from ten to thirty or forty thousand people.

The steps to be taken to make such a concrete example practicable and effective would seem to be these :

1. A corporation should be formed under the laws of any state, but preferably of the state in which the proposed county is to be located, with a broad charter to buy and sell land, colonize and improve the same, and do all that an individual could do to settle and develop a county. The *personnel* should be men not only of sufficient capital and intelligence to bring the matter to a conclusion, but of such public reputation for business ability, integrity, and patriotism as to command public confidence. The persons thus associated should act under a prior agreement, to become a part of the constitution of the incorporation, defining explicitly that the purpose of the company is to colonize a definite territory and assist the settlers to secure homes, cultivate the soil, develop water, build towns and cities, facilitate transportation, and otherwise coöperate with them to subdue the soil and produce and distribute wealth. This prior agreement should state definitely under what terms and conditions this is to be done; the rate of interest to be charged on loans or deferred payments, the division of profits, what restrictive clauses, if any, are to be put in deeds of property, what persons shall be admitted or excluded, what natural resources are to be reserved as county property when the county government shall have been erected, and otherwise publishing beforehand the aims of the company, that settlers may know what to expect and be protected in their honest and laudable endeavors to surround themselves with the con-

veniences and comforts due to the measure of their own labors, intelligence, and frugality.

2. The next step would be the selection of a territory. This would involve soil, climate, variety of resources and values, location, water supply, land titles, present population, relation to existing railways, and state laws as to facility for erecting an independent county government. In all probability California offers the largest opportunity. The soil and climate are of the best, the variety and value of productive resources are unequaled, the possibilities by means of irrigation of maintaining a large population on a small area are enormous, probably ten times that of the non-irrigated lands; vast tracts of land, larger than many eastern counties, exist in Mexican land grants under single title, inhabited now solely by vast herds of cattle and a few *vaqueros*, and in a state where agriculture and horticulture with their tributary industries are the leading occupations, and where new counties can be easily formed.

A little reflection on these suggestions will obviate the necessity of going further into details with readers whose patriotism or Christianity is real.

The end in view is not money, but *homes*—home, the seat of industry, affection, patience, faith, mutual consideration and forbearance, and so the nursery of morality, the promoter of peace, harmony, and love. When the home is a *productive* home, the sources of its wealth and the field of its mutual labor are within the compass of a few rods from the hearthstone, there can be no conflict between capital and labor; and where the domain of common wealth and interests are within a few miles of the center of such an industrial community, there will be little room for party politics. It makes no difference to the producer whether wheat is 50 cents or \$2.00 a bushel if he eats it, and so of all productions, whether raw or manufactured. A production is not complete until it is ready for the mouth or the back, or a minister otherwise to the comfort and elevation of mankind. Thus all are producers and all are consumers, and it is the wildest folly to separate them by a thousand miles or more, so far, and through so many greedy, lustful, and cruel

hands, that the bushel of raw wheat is all used up before a kernel gets back in the shape of flour to the producer's hand and he has nothing to do but starve. "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" What shall it profit a country to gain the markets of the world and lose its own? What shall it profit a tiller of the soil to feed the great cities and starve himself? There are vast districts of our country lying idle to-day and becoming depopulated because of their remoteness from great markets, the cost of transportation, high rates of interest, and diminishing intelligence and morality of the tiller of the soil, which have natural resources capable of maintaining millions of people if a sufficient number were brought into a limited area, to create their own market, producing and manufacturing for their own needs, and exporting only the surplus. Such communities would become the richest and happiest in the land. Labor is God's moral agent for sinful human nature. It is the hopper from which will come the fine flour of civic reform.

To say that such a practical example is Utopian or impossible is to insult the Christian spirit and practical ability of our people. It is a problem, of course, and requires abilities such as built the Brooklyn Bridge, but it was built, and millions took advantage of it, and it pays, which the projectors knew would be the result.

Millions of our people to-day are seeking homes, or seeking to make their own home more secure and happy. It is the aim and desire of the heart and it is godlike. When government land is thrown open to settlement, hundreds of thousands join in the wild rush to secure a homestead, and sacrifice many things, sometimes even life itself, in their endeavors to own a piece of land. Thousands are crowded out altogether, many are disappointed in what they get; in the aggregate the cost of haste and waste will foot up a grand total which would buy land and settle it in decency and order, with far greater accruing benefits to the settler.

Such a plan as outlined herein is a simple business propo-

sition. The projectors should and could share to a limited extent in the production of wealth. It would furnish a safe field for investments. It would demonstrate that Christian men love their fellow-men, and that there are wiser methods of using surplus capital than for merely making more money or spending it, by mistaken charity, in almsgiving, or for educational purposes which the tiller of the soil can never enjoy. Next to publishing and ministering the Gospel, the best thing you can do for a man is to give him something to do. Add to that the pleasures of *hope*, that his labor is to enlarge his wealth, benefit his children, increase his capacity, and furnish a support in his declining years, and you have done all that you can. Thenceforth he will take care of himself.

The field, the people, the capital, the ability, the desire are all here, and certainly "the field is white to the harvest." Who will go into the Lord's vineyard and work?

THOMAS W. HASKINS.

DANGERS OF PATERNALISM.

BY G. F. MILTON.

SOCIETY naturally separates into two great political groups, the one, governed by natural development unhampered by restraint, giving rise to individualism; the other, establishing and strengthening state supervision, producing some form of socialism. This, of course, is a broad division of the many characters of existing polities, but it expresses clearly the extremely opposite view of government as held by the various nations of the world.

"I am the State," said Louis XIV., and in him France came under the highest form of centralized government. This, in spite of the Revolution, has never been entirely overthrown; and France to-day exhibits the spectacle of a form of government apparently free, but most protective in fact.

The tendency of England, on the other hand, has always been to promote the diffusion of authority. The privileges, originally granted to freemen and municipalities, have been gradually extended, and each generation has seen the further enfranchisement of the citizen and the withdrawal of administrative interference. The fullest opportunity for unrestricted individual exertion has been given and the accomplishment of the race is the resultant. In the words of Henry Thomas Buckle: "What with us is competition, with them is monopoly. That which we effect by private companies they effect by public boards. They cannot cut a canal or lay down a railroad without appealing to the government for aid. With them the people look to the rulers. With us the rulers look to the people. With them the executive is the center from which society radiates. With us society is the instigator and the executive the organ."

England's freedom has grown and expanded till now its con-

stitution is the admiration of Christendom ; while the French, although they have struggled and rebelled against many forms of tyrannies, have never succeeded entirely in throwing off the yoke of political servitude. They have not been able to combine permanence with liberty, and their free governments have not been stable, nor their stable governments free. They have always retained their system of espionage and surveillance, and so protect the citizen against the assumed evil intentions of his neighbors, that they have been called a nation of children. The state is the guardian, supervisor, and controller of their destinies, and is assumed to be more intelligent than the mass of the governed. The first requisite of political education is thus taken away, the habit of spontaneous action for a collective interest entirely lost, and an understanding of the true meaning of liberty made impossible.

Do we see symptoms of this political atrophy in America?

What is the significance of these large bodies of the presumably unemployed laborers making their demands of Congress? Is it a duty of the legislative function of our government to see that the people of the country shall have remunerative employment? Is not this a new thing unprovided for by the founders of the government?

When our forefathers framed that admirable instrument known as the Constitution of the United States, they established a balance between administrative centralization and distribution of authority, on the perpetuation of which, in its original form, depends the preservation of our institutions.

The federal system was not, as is often asserted, a direct adaptation of the English form. "We neither have nor can have the members to compose it, nor the rights, privileges, and properties of so distinct a class to guard," said Chas. Pinckney in the Convention of 1787. The time-honored institutions, the heritage of our Anglo-Saxon ancestry, it is true, were the main ingredients of the composition, but the system of federation on which the states entered into the Union was greatly the product of the minds of those men who composed the Convention of 1787. Theory entered much into formulating a plan

out of the chaotic ideas with which the members came together.

The debates are full of references to the writings of Montesquieu, the French philosopher, and Madison and Hamilton referred to him constantly in the *Federalist*. It is admitted that the following maxims of political faith from that author's "Spirit of Laws" contain the principles on which our plan of government was established :

"If a republic be small it is destroyed by a foreign force; if it be large it is ruined by an internal imperfection. It is, therefore, very probable that mankind would have been at length obliged to live constantly under the government of a single person, had they not contrived a kind of constitution that has all the internal advantages of a republican, with the external force of a monarchical government. I mean a confederate republic. A republic of this kind, able to withstand an external force, may support itself without any internal corruption. The form of this society prevents all manner of inconveniences. The state may be destroyed on one part and not on the other; the confederacy may be dissolved and the confederates preserve their sovereignty."

This was essentially the idea embodied into our federal system and on the check thus established, between the central and the local authority, depends the preservation of that system in its pristine purity and equality. "If a republic is large it is ruined by an internal imperfection." This principle is now acknowledged, and the separate autonomy of state, county, township, and city, is therefore recognized as the supreme requisite for the maintenance of the Union.

The United States has no formidable neighbor to cause a sacrifice of individual liberty for the sake of national existence, as was the case with Germany; consequently it offered the opportunity for the highest development of such a decentralized system as the framers of the Constitution intended. Until 1861 the danger was that the federal power would be too utterly stripped of its prerogatives, and the sovereignty of the state elevated above that of the Union. In the crucial test of the Civil War, however, the latter triumphed, and as is always the case

when a question is settled by the arbitrament of arms, the effect of the previous sixty years was entirely annihilated and the contrary tendency established, and it has constantly gained strength since that time. This is shown by the legislation of the dominant party.

Tariffs, previous to 1861, had never been more than incidentally protective. The constitutionality even of these had always been denied. Henry Clay, the greatest advocate of the "American system," explained in the Senate in 1833 that protection was never intended to be permanent, and proposed that the existing duties should be gradually reduced as the industries they aided became stronger, so that a minimum of 20 per cent *ad valorem* should be reached in 1842. The financial necessities of the war, of course, caused heavy taxation, both direct and indirect. But the nation expected these excessive rates to be lowered as soon as there was no longer absolute need of them. This was not done, however. The wishes of a class, who comprised less than one eighteenth of the industrial population, were consulted, and the war tariff was not only retained, but even gradually increased, so that the McKinley Act of 1890 put in effect higher duties than the Morrill tariff of 1864.

This is one feature of the growth of paternalism. The state has held out its fostering hand, favored classes partake of its bounty, certain occupations are made remunerative, set free from competitive influences, to the detriment of others. It is not strange, then, that the government is considered the source of all things, the fountain from which flows blessings and misfortunes, the regulator of prices and wages. To legislation is due all prosperity; ill fortune must likewise be a result of its errors.

The growth of this liberty destroying tendency is little noticed. With insidious creepings it fastens its octopian arms on the body politic, before scarcely its presence is perceived.

The first cause in which it robs the people of their privileges is always a worthy one. A railway is built to connect East and West. Great internal improvements are made alluring to local selfishness. Those who served with honor in war are pensioned.

Then follows the extension of the corporate authority ; the purchase of foreign territory, whether or not it could become a homogeneous part of the nation ; the establishing of protectorates beyond the reach of our material interests. And these precedents once made, no great party will hesitate at any legislation especially favoring an interest or locality with which it is identified, or the extension of conquests for which it attains a transitory glory. Step by step the powers given the government in the intention of its founders are exceeded, and each stride serves to take from the individual some of his separate duties and privileges as a citizen, and make him more a political child.

Socialism is prevailing over individualism. The state is gradually absorbing the franchise of the citizen. The effect of this extends to the smallest township.

Toulmin-Smith points out the advantages of local self-government over centralization in these graphic words : "Local self-government is that system of government under which the greatest number of minds knowing the most and having the fullest opportunities of knowing it, about the special matter in hand, and having the greatest interest in its well-working have the management of it, or control over it. Centralization is that system of government under which the smallest number of minds and those knowing the least, and having the fewest opportunities of knowing it, about the special matter in hand, and having the smallest interest in its well-working, have the management of it, or control over it."

Yet, these truths seem to offer no warning. Just as the national government has absorbed many prerogatives and functions of the state governments, so also the latter have assumed more direct control of the citizen. The result is that in many towns and cities the commonest matters of a general nature are decided and managed by boards, or commissions, appointed by the executive of the state. Paternalism has worked its way into things of the most local concern. The state has entered into our home life. "The play of the competitive forces, which has so largely contributed to the extraordinary expansion of the

past, must be not only restricted but, perhaps, ultimately suspended, in an era of soul deadening and energy restricting socialism on the one side, and general confusion and political insolvency on the other," says Benjamin Kidd.

An extreme of anarchy or an absolutism, as much to be feared, threatens our existence. Our preservation depends on the dissemination of political knowledge in the widest degree, among the people. Science attributes progress to the increasing difficulty of existence, caused by the growing population and exhausting resources of the world.

Each succeeding generation must, therefore, be more capable, or it cannot sustain life. Advance is imperative. Just so the fact that much depends on the political franchise, that it must be exercised often and intelligently, that the purity and high character of the ballot is a necessity to personal liberty, are factors which keep up the political knowledge of a people. When the franchise is robbed of its effect, or delegated in some particular, when responsibility for conduct of offices is so distributed that blame cannot be placed where deserved, the citizen loses interest. His political consciousness becomes dulled. He exerts himself less in public and more in private matters, and thus machine politics and highly developed party organizations, which feed on the ignorant voter, become possible.

Solon saw this tendency and established a law that the citizen who refused to take sides one way or another in an insurrection should be declared infamous. The good members of society, as in nearly all communities, being always in the majority, there was little fear that an uprising would succeed in overturning the state.

A government, to be perfect, needs the active thought, interest, and participation of every individual of the governed. "The greatest though not insuperable difficulty in constitutional legislation lies in the danger that in the multiplicity of elements at work the unit thought may be lost," says K. Brater, the German publicist. And John Stuart Mill thus shows the necessity of great dependence being placed on the individual in order that political knowledge may be widespread: "The only

security against political slavery is the check maintained over governors by the diffusion of intelligence, activity, and public spirit among the governed. Experience proves the extreme difficulty of permanently keeping up a sufficiently high standard of these qualities. . . . It is, therefore, of supreme importance that all classes of the community down to the lowest should have much to do for themselves, that as great a demand should be made upon their intelligence and virtue as it is in any respect equal to, that the government should not only leave, as far as possible, to their own faculties the conduct of whatever concerns themselves alone, but should suffer them to, or rather encourage them to, manage as many as possible of their joint concerns by voluntary coöperation ; since this discussion and management of collective interests is the great school of that public spirit and the great source of that intelligence of public affairs which are always regarded as the distinctive character of the public of free countries."

And the effect of the opposite tendency is pointed out by M. De Tocqueville : "Administrative centralization only enervates the people who submit to it because it ever tends to diminish their public spirit. It succeeds, it is true, in bringing together all the forces a nation can dispose of at a given time and in a given place, but it is prejudicial to the reproduction of these forces, it makes a nation triumph on the day of battle, but it diminishes her power in the long run."

The American people cannot observe the strengthening of our government without alarm. Its protective character has been extended to so many interests, sections, and classes that the whole nation has become imbued with its theory. It is, therefore, not astonishing that those hitherto aided classes should now in the time of their need demand the subsistence which they have been taught it was the duty of the state to furnish. It is absurd to blame workingmen or tramps for going to the place and body from which they have for so long been assured comfort and prosperity must come.

The American spirit, that most famous trait of our national character, that which prompted the frontiersmen to plunge

deeper into the wilderness in the face of terrible hardships and perils and ever maintain an independence that was the admiration of the world, is a thing of the past. "Thirty years of protection have made the American an irrational, whimpering nursling of Congress and the Department of the Interior," says a great New York journal.

With the development of the paternal character of the government, individualism is losing place. While England, under the leadership of that great Liberal party, whose work has done so much to broaden the political ideas of the nineteenth century, is casting away, one by one, the last traces of governmental interference and approaching closer to the democratic ideal of which our forefathers furnished the world an example, we are caught in a vortex of French and German socialistic tendencies, and the institutions which are the bulwark of our security seem gradually becoming endangered by the engrafting of these new ideas on the popular mind. Our unexampled resources and consequent prosperity have hitherto prevented an awakening as to the dangers we incur by the growth of these tendencies.

The present movements of the unemployed reveal the relation which the citizen imagines existing between himself and the government. He looks to it instead of letting it depend on him. This feeling is the surest destroyer of political intelligence. It is the most dangerous feature of our recent development. The American Republic is not so firmly established but that a tendency of this kind, carried too far, would prove fatal to the liberties of the people. A large republic is destroyed by internal corruption. Our system must, therefore, retain its confederated feature. The submergence of the state into the nation would create the too large republic subject to imperfections, from which revolution alone could free it.

"If we Americans were to set about giving to the state governments things to do that had better be done by counties and towns, and giving the federal government things to do that had better be done by the states, it would not take many generations to dull the keen edge of our political capacity. We will lose it as inevitably as the most consummate of pianists will lose his

facility if he stops practicing," says John Fiske. Every act of the general government which takes away any of the duties of the citizen, or interferes with him in his private life, or the conduct of his business, decreases his political knowledge and makes him less capable of properly exercising the franchise of citizenship.

When economic forces are disturbed by aids and subsidies to certain classes of industries, when a state or town lends its credit or means to one large corporation to the disinterest of competition, when certain individuals are enjoying subsidies for past services while others equally worthy receive none, the natural forces of development become thwarted in their effect and man sees in the government the cause. He is the enjoyer of its benefice or the sufferer from its errors. It is to him the good or the bad parent. Instead of a subjective agent, the sensitive instrument of a nation's will, it has become a potential force, acting separately of its own accord, and the citizen is the abject slave, beseeching its fostering aid or praying it to relieve his burdens. In this will be found one of the secrets of our financial distress.

Let us return to the old spirit. We are suffering from too much interference. The best government is the least. American soil will support twenty people where there is now one. Our resources are comparatively untouched. Instead of looking to the center for aid as a remedy for our troubles, let us find it in the individual efforts of the citizen.

G. F. MILTON.

A LABOR TRUST.

BY E. M. BURCHARD.

THE word trust has few peers in human speech ; it is a most noble word. While the words, "Trust in the Lord and do good ; so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed," cannot be taken as a literal statement of fact, the concurrent testimony of the ages is that trust is an available resource of humanity. The words, "I trust you," form the noblest compliment that man can address to his fellow, and the faithful discharge of trust is the summit of human achievement.

The first and chiefest of all trusts is that of the family, in which one man and one woman form a trust, committing to it their hopes, their happiness, and the welfare of future generations ; and although these trusts do not all pay regular dividends, still the most and best of human happiness arises out of them. The germ of the modern trust had primal planting in human nature, but its finest fruitage is not yet.

The word trust has by virtue of modern use gotten into bad repute with many, chiefly those upon the outside of these modern exemplifications of economy ; to the beneficiaries they are, however, a haven of refuge from the anarchy of mistrust and distrust. The modern trust is the joining together of many to secure the economical production of wealth, trusting to an equitable division of the net results. There is nothing in the nature of trusts but what is most commendable. That the power of a trust may be abused is true ; but all power is open to the same charge. The trust is also an embodiment of the true spirit of socialism, its members abandoning competitive methods for those that are coöperative, exchanging war for peace, the spoil of the victor for the proceeds of equitable division.

The real objection to trusts is that instead of being one they are many ; instead of blessing all they enrich the few. The shrewdest business men of the country are forming trusts because they clearly perceive the immense advantages of this method of production ; the moral of this object lesson is that the rest of us would better be shrewd, too, instead of railing against the successful methods of our betters. If the trust method is a good one, and the condition of the trusters points that way, then we all want some of it ; and our duty is to make trusts for ourselves rather than to break the trusts of others.

Naturally, trusts are first formed by the wealthy few whose interests chance to be nearly identical, then by those more numerous and less wealthy ; and it is easily possible that the laboring masses may by degrees come up to the trusting level. "To him that hath shall be given" is the law of nature, just as it is that the rolling snowball shall grow bigger. There is, however, no *giving* about the business. The man who has already been sharp enough to get a little, is more likely to get *more* than is the man who has not begun at all to get *some*: a man's fortune is a snowball with the man's life in it. The trust has come to stay ; those who trust have the advantage of the distrusters ; the moral is obvious.

The trust method is exactly opposed to the distrust method ; the one is the outgrowth of civilization, the other is a relic of barbarism. The motive for industry is profit, or dividends, as we now say. Men invest their capital for the sole purpose of getting dividends. The trust method is better because the dividends are larger and surer.

Under the trust method, capital takes a silent partner ; it adds to itself an element of power that is practically costless, and which earns a dividend ; this reënforcing element is *trust* or confidence. It is a modern discovery that trust, wisely employed, yields dividends of a size not to be despised. Perhaps no discovery of modern times begins to compare with this one, which most of us have not discovered yet, which has come upon us like an angel's visit—unperceived by our dull eyes. No patent has been issued for it ; no one claims the honor of the

discovery; the political economy that is to take account of it yet remains to be written; but all the same a new power has come into the world; the night of industry has broken into morning; a sun has arisen with light and power; the dividends that are to be drawn from the element of *trust* will be greater than those which have ever been obtained from capital.

It is also a fact of utmost significance that while capital seems a natural monopoly of the few, trust is the common heritage of the many. It is not too much to say that trust is, to the multitude, a boundless source of costless capital, of which they cannot be robbed, and which no selfishness can monopolize.

It has taken the world ages to discover that war is bad politics; that it is more profitable to trade with one's neighbors than to rob them. It is also beginning to be discovered that the principles and practices of war are bad in business; that it is better that all should labor under fair exchange than that the spoils of industry should adorn the triumph of the conqueror. Surely dividends upon the element of trustfulness are better than the losses which are wont to follow the exercise of that virtue, and this is what we derive from the trust.

What is a labor trust? or rather what would be a labor trust? for our subject is rather within the domain of prophecy than of description. Any arrangement by which laborers may invest their capital, which is their power to labor—their strength and skill, with the element of trustfulness, and draw dividends upon the whole, would be a labor trust.

The capital of the laborer is of all kinds the hardest to save because it will not keep. A thousand dollars in the bank will be just as good to-morrow or next week as it is to-day, but a day's labor of one thousand men, worth perhaps just as much or even more, will not keep over night. Whatever value it had in the morning, if it remain unused, will be found to have vanished at the setting of the sun. This obvious and most important fact seems to have escaped general observation; at all events, its significance is not appreciated. The wealth of society has been running out of this open spigot for ages, and all because a great many persons must needs take hold together in

order to turn it shut. The hope of labor is that ere long the requisite number of hands will join in the effort. To make all comparatively rich it is only necessary to stop the waste of human labor and prevent the stealing of it. I challenge any intelligent denial of this simple proposition.

To save all human labor it is only necessary to establish labor facilities within reach of all who possess this most valuable yet most fleeting source of wealth; and this is not difficult because it is labor, and labor alone, that produces the facilities for labor, factories, tools, engines, machinery, fuel, raw materials, etc.

If in certain localities at particular times a golden dew was known to fall in considerable quantity, men would certainly be there with appliances for gathering it; it would not be allowed to go to waste. Around every workingman a golden dew will fall every day in the year if a few simple conditions are complied with, if only facilities for labor are provided. It is a well-known fact that factories, engines, tools, and machinery do gather this golden dew; do actually transform the sweat of labor into articles of wealth better than gold, which infallibly compel the gold from all who have it. It is the office of a trust to save the vast amount of wealth which daily might be, but which now alas! is not.

The children of Israel in the desert had their wealth of miraculous manna, but it would not keep over night except once a week and then but for another day. Our manna is our power to labor; it has no miraculous origin, but we may, if we will, store and keep it. All material wealth is but the stored manna of daily toil. Our national poverty, of which we brag little considering its abundance, is but the manna that we carelessly neglect to gather.

To save the now wasted labor wealth of the nation would result in the creation of a vast amount of material wealth, and this would require to be somewhere, for one cannot possess actual wealth without having a place to put it. Poverty imposes no such obligation as this; which fact has been noted as one of the advantages of poverty, but few are able to see it in

that light. Before we can undertake to secure this vast increase of wealth we must needs decide what is to be done with it—where to put it. It is not so much a question of storehouses as of possession—*who shall enjoy it?*

It is a well-known fact that the sole present obstacle to the unlimited creation of wealth is the *getting rid of it*. This getting rid of wealth we now call selling it because trade is the single channel of distribution; and to distribute by means of trade is to distribute what the trader can sell at a profit and to leave all the rest.

Factories shut down and the operatives are relegated to idleness solely because traders cannot sell the product at a profit. It would be just as reasonable to chop off the heads of the workmen for the same cause; and there would be this advantage, it would relieve an overstocked labor market.

That trade, absolutely free trade, does not provide adequate means of distribution for the products of toil is only too apparent. And why should it? It has no such object in view; its purpose is the exactly opposite one of exacting a profit from distribution. Trade facilitates distribution much as the toll-gate facilitates travel. Before one may collect toll upon the highway he must provide a highway, and the charges are limited by law. But the trader provides only such a channel as suits himself; he collects whatever toll he may be able to extort, and is at liberty to absolutely block the path of distribution whenever he chooses to do so, and to extort whatever the necessities of men compel them to pay. The assumption that free trade is a free and efficient method of distribution is one of those amusing absurdities that still remains to be laughed out of countenance.

All wealth is now created for the purpose of getting rid of it. The farmer raises wheat for that purpose, the shoemaker makes shoes and the hatter hats, the tailor makes clothes and the miller makes flour; and all the other producers are working for the same end. Each and every toiler makes something, not primarily to *use*, but to *sell*, in order that he may gain the product of others. This is but another way of saying that the business of producing wealth is now localized and specialized, and made

absolutely dependent upon means of distribution and exchange. *In order to produce more wealth we must cease all concern about production and attend to the business of exchange.* Production will inevitably keep pace with exchange until the natural limit of productive effort has been reached.

All the channels of trade are now clogged with wealth ; a universal effort is made to restrict production—*create poverty*—so as to relieve the congestion of trade ; and millions are suffering for the want of the very articles which they are forbidden to make in their idleness because the trade channel refuses to convey and deliver to them. We have, on the one hand, a superabundance of wealth and wealth-producing power, a congested trade channel, and an unconquerable mass of destitution on the other. In view of this fact have we any other business *except that of making a new channel* ? How many more years ought we to spend in doctoring the trade channel with tariff bills ? How many of us ever reflect that a great and general conflagration that would annihilate wealth by the billion dollars' worth and lay great cities in ashes would be a godsend to the working class, would relieve them from want and misery by furnishing an abundance of work and good wages ? Who shall say that our working, or rather, our loafing men are not virtuous withstanding such temptation ?

Returning now to the question of what to do with the wealth resulting from universal industry, the answer is short—Pay the workman's wages with it, and use it all in that way ; do not leave an atom to accumulate and pose as overproduction in the very face of starving humanity and well-fed beasts.

This discovery in the realm of political economy is the finding of a new continent, the locating of a western hemisphere in the labor world. Wealth production is now absolutely restricted because the wealth absorbers have really no place to put it—the business sponges are full—and willing working people are starving because it is not lawful to squeeze the sponges or possible to get anything by another channel.

There is absolutely no limit to the production of wealth if we will but pay the worker with it. This is the key to the labor problem,

the social problem, the poverty problem; it is all there is of honesty and justice in public affairs.

In order to accomplish this chiefest of human ends we need the *labor trust*, something to which each worker may intrust his day's work assured of getting it again. Organize all labor that has nothing better to do, provide opportunity to transform each day's strength and skill into some form of useful wealth, the product to be held by the trust. Estimate as accurately as possible the worth of each day's toil and give the worker a certificate of the amount that will be honored by the trust with an equivalent choice of all its possessions. This will be paying each worker the full amount of his net addition to the world's wealth in the product of any other workers toil; and this is all that a laborer can desire or have if exact justice be done. This but requires lawful provision, not even an appropriation; it needs but opportunity, labor will do the rest.

Why not open the door into the workingman's paradise? We do not have to make the paradise or even to keep it in order. Who shall say that we do not need a labor trust, that we may not have one; and who will withhold the effort to make real such an ideal?

E. M. BURCHARD.

A PROPOSED REMEDY FOR THE RAILROAD TROUBLES.

BY HON. GEORGE GARY.

MANY who regard the socialistic idea of the "ownership and control by the whole people of the means of production and distribution" as a Utopian dream, are yet more than half disposed to favor government ownership and operation of the railroads of the country. The experience of the recent Quixotic strike of the American Railway Union, for the avowed purpose of redressing the wrongs of the employees of the Pullman Company, and, probably, for the unavowed purpose of establishing their power to dictate the terms on which any great industry may be carried on, has added largely to the sentiment in favor of government ownership and control.

Plans and proposed legislation for the creation of boards of arbitration do not inspire much confidence, because it is admitted that there is no power anywhere to compel disputing parties to submit to arbitration. Of course it cannot be tolerated that any man, or any executive board, of any organization, shall have and exercise the power to suspend the operations of commerce and open the way for riot, plunder, arson, and murder, to compel any man or corporation to do what no law can compel them to do. And yet it might happen at some future time, when such a strike is ordered, that one of the governors who protested against the prompt and laudable action of the president during the recent strike and riots at Chicago, or one like them, may be president of the United States. What would follow in such case no man can guess. So the feeling in favor of government ownership of the railroads grows, because no other sure safeguard against the dangers of the future is seen.

I desire to suggest a possible remedy for the consideration of

thoughtful men, who justly fear the consequences of any great extension of the functions of the federal government. Railway companies are something more than private corporations. Their franchises include the exercises of the right of eminent domain. They exercise that right for the purpose of constructing a railroad, as the public exercises it for the purpose of constructing a wagon-road. We give them this power because railroads are public highways—the great arteries of a commerce of which wagon-roads are the small veins. They are at least quasi-public highways. Their functions are quasi-public functions. Over them is conducted the greater part of that commerce between the states which the federal government has the same constitutional power to regulate that it has to regulate foreign commerce. The Interstate Commerce Law and Commission interfere in their dealings with those who use them to prevent extortion and unjust discrimination under this constitutional power.

No man or corporation can be compelled to construct and operate a great line of railroad. But when any corporation does so voluntarily, it becomes subject to that power to regulate its interstate operations in the interest of the whole people. No man can be compelled to enter the employment of a great railroad corporation. If he enters it voluntarily, he is in a quasi-public employment. Whether he performs the duties of that employment properly is not merely, and only, a question between him and his employer. The public has an interest in it to be protected.

The power to regulate commerce between the states includes power to require the adoption and use of such brakes, car heaters, and other appliances, as are best adapted to secure the safety of the persons and property of those who use the railroads. It might require the employment of only competent men in their operation. If necessary it may prescribe the conditions under which they may be employed.

It is not unusual for legislation in the public interest to limit the conditions of future contracts. Some states provide by law what every contract for insurance shall be. If a premium is

paid and policy issued, the law, and not the words of the policy, determines what the contract is. The principle of protection to the rights and interests of the public by law, as applied to commerce between the states, is surely unquestionable. Let it be applied to contracts of employment upon railroads engaged in such commerce.

It is against the effects of great strikes on the railroads that protection for the interests of the public is needed. Let the law make the terms of the contract of employment on such railroads to be that the employment is for a certain stated period of time during which the employee shall not be discharged (unless for just cause), nor his wages reduced without his consent, and during which he shall not quit his employment (unless for just cause) without the consent of his employer. Penalties—as the forfeiture of a month's pay—for quitting, or payment for an extra month for discharging, without just cause, would generally secure the performance of such a contract on both sides. Such a law should, of course, be carefully prepared after a close investigation of the whole subject. Perhaps the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission might be extended to questions which might arise under it.

The right of railroad companies to discharge an employee, or reduce wages at pleasure, I think has been considerably checked in its exercise by the unions among employees, and it is not very improbable that they have sometimes submitted to insubordination and neglect of duty, rather than to meet the consequences of different action. It is clear that it would be better that their rights and the corresponding obligations should be regulated by law, than by the action, or fear of the action, of irresponsible men or bodies of men. In such employment the public interest requires that the law of right, not the law of might, shall regulate the relations of employer and employee.

It is probable that in any such legislation as is here proposed, provision should be made so that the contracts of any class of employees should not all expire at the same time. The details of such a law, however, I am neither competent nor disposed to

consider now. My purpose here is to suggest a plan which I have not seen or heard suggested elsewhere.

Contracts for a stated time in the employment of labor are not unusual. Seamen, engaged in foreign commerce, ship for a voyage and the law regulates the terms and conditions of their employment, excepting their wages. Agricultural labor is nearly always hired for a stated time. Courts hold such a contract to be an entirety, and will not enforce payment if the employee quits before the contract time expires, unless something equivalent to a breach on the other side justifies the quitting. In many employments the exigencies of the business require that the employment of labor shall be under time contracts.

If (as I believe) the constitutional authority to regulate commerce between the states will sustain such legislation as is here proposed, it seems to me to provide a means for establishing upon a sure basis the rights and obligations of both railroad companies engaged in interstate commerce and their employees, and would protect the rights and interests of the public.

No man would be compelled to accept railroad employment under such a law, but plenty of men would be willing to do so, for it would not impair any just or valuable right. And it is not probable that many men would incur the loss of wages already earned for the wild purpose of coercing the whole public to attempt the coercion of a manufacturing corporation into compliance with the demands of its employees—a species of coöperative knight-errantry, which, having no precedent, should have no following, leaving the single instance to stand alone in the history of our times as an object lesson.

GEORGE GARY.

RELIGION CARRIED INTO CITIZENSHIP.

AN IMPORTANT NEW MOVEMENT.

BY HENRY RANDALL WAITE, PH.D.

THE representatives of religion are beginning to understand that a chief cause of their inability to "reach the masses" is because they have sought to do the reaching too much by talk and too little by hand. That a drowning man will reject the Beatitudes in favor of a rope, that a starving man will prefer bread to a confession of faith, and that one homeless or overborne by calamities will welcome the hand-clasp of a sympathetic and helpful fellow-man more readily than Scripture texts, ought never to have needed demonstration. As the Founder of Christianity ministered to bodily as well as spiritual needs, interested himself in the betterment of temporal as well as provision for eternal conditions, and sought to introduce into human society divine ideas, it would seem that these things should be so undeniably among the chief concerns of his nineteenth century disciples, as to secure for them due attention without question. That this is not true; on the contrary, that efforts to secure the recognition of this truth should be looked upon as departures from the established order, however creditable to those who make the departures, is certainly not to the credit of Christianity at large. That Christianity should prove itself by Christ-like men, and that it thus obtains its chief power, is undeniable. That the extent of its power is far less than it might and should be is also unquestionable.

If now Christians of every name will give less attention to varying and divisional interpretations of Scripture, sectarian fence-building, discreditable proselyting, magnifying of ceremonials, heresy hunting, higher and lower criticism, and all other unduly emphasized grounds of difference, and will come back

to the noble level of the simple life of Christ, may they not, in thus doing, find themselves brought into his nearness to publicans, sinners, and all other men; and will they not thus solve the question of "reaching the masses"? We think so. But we think also that this happy result will not be vouchsafed to those who cling with too much tenacity to the misconceived notions of pure and unadulterated religion by which it is confounded with the acceptance of either thirty-nine or forty-nine articles, longer or shorter confessions, fellowship with any select body of religionists, Romanist, Greek, Hebrew, Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Episcopalian, Reformed, Lutheran, Evangelical, Unitarian, or any one of the sects or subdivisions of sects which, by claiming superior loyalty to divinely revealed truths, give to their members occasion for the assumption that their choice of sectarian doctrine or fellowship assures them a nearness to the All Father not permitted to their brethren.

Doctrines may and ought to be steps in the stairway to highest truth, as each man "feeling after God," with the best light obtainable, places his feet on that which lifts him Godward. But men should not be taught to mistake any one of its steps for the whole stairway, or the whole stairway for that which it simply helps to bring them to—the truth as God reveals it at the stairway's summit: that truth which men are permitted to enter as into a lasting and glorious tabernacle; a simple, recognized, and eternal reality; the truth of God's fatherhood, man's sonship, the brotherhood of humanity, and the holy obligation of all who thus realize the joy and blessing of God's love, to love each other as he loves them, and to govern their lives accordingly. Thus every sectarian stairway, with varying steps of doctrine and human ideas, may and should be a hallowed footway for human approach to one house of faith, and the practical unity in earthly fellowship and labors of the one and indivisible company of God's children. All who come to anything like a full realization of the meaning of God's fatherhood, whatever the way by which they reach it, should have, must have, in truth can have, no other desire than to

make themselves and their fellow-men in some degree worthy of the love in the very sensibility of which they find a revelation of their own unworthiness. Recognizing the fact that it is because of nothing that they have done or thought, because of neither belief nor unbelief, that God has always loved them, but simply because they are his children, it must be plain to them that their belief has not won or purchased his love, but has only brought them (by whatever devious way of doctrinal or undoctinal thinking) into its appreciation, benediction, and enjoyment.

On the height of blessing of this soul-possessioning consciousness of the love of God for all men, it is inconceivable that any one man should for a moment think, much less give speech to, the thought that God's love is his in larger measure because he came into it by some one stairway, such as Romanism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, or any other *ism*. If as his children he loves us regardless of sects, when we make no effort to be worthy of his love, it is as his children, and not as members of sects, that he loves us when we realize and seek to be worthy of his love. Of one family, all we are brethren, and he who is our Father, as is clearly taught in the gospels, has no favorites among those who truly seek to do his will. With a clearer comprehension of this fact, there will be more unity among religious believers; less desire to gain accessions to the ranks of sects; more earnestness and greater success in bringing men, regardless of sectarian byways, into the heavenward highway; and with all, an enlargement of the power of those who consider themselves accepted citizens of the Kingdom of God, as well as members of the earthly commonwealth, in which as citizens, also, by virtue of their Christian obligations, they have a present and binding engagement to wage ceaseless battle with the mammon of unrighteousness in all its forms.

Every movement in the direction of social and political reform has waited, and languished while waiting, for this enlarged power of Christianity. These movements in our own land will go forward to triumphant success when the whole brotherhood of religious believers shall strive together in the unity of godly

citizenship for the establishment, in politics, legislatures, courts, statutes, and all places of civic power and responsibility, of the righteousness that exalteth a nation. The organic union of sects which men seek to bring about by that paring and slicing of doctrines which shall fit them to a common measure, is of trivial importance in comparison with the practicable, vitally essential, and immediate union of all God-fearing citizens in efforts to secure the doing of his instead of the devil's will in the alienated kingdoms of politics, business, and society. Christians who cannot find a common meeting place in the fields of theology, may, and are duty bound to stand and work together in the field of civics, for the maintenance of those principles in ethics, civil polity, law, and economics, which it is in their power through united endeavor to maintain; the general disregard of which is due to their neglect; and whose reassertion and victory can be secured only by their faithfulness.

The Institutional Church League, in which some fifty churches of different denominations have recently united, represents a notable broadening of religious thought and activities in the direction of extending the influences of religion by a genuine and loving hand-reach among the neglected multitudes of our great cities. What has thus been accomplished in the amelioration of evil conditions, as through the Berkeley Temple in Boston, the Tabernacle in Jersey City, the Judson Memorial Work in New York, and other like efforts, is remarkable as an indication of the great and open field which lies before the religious people of America, but still more remarkable as an evidence of obvious, ever present, and sacred obligations long and shamefully neglected.

Out of these hopeful efforts, and to a certain extent in connection with them, there now comes a beginning of united effort in the direction of specially applying the principles of religion in the discharge of citizenship obligations. A "Department of Applied Ethics" has been established under the auspices of the American Institute of Civics, in the activities of which members of all denominations will be invited to par-

ticipate, and through which it is proposed to conduct a propaganda of good citizenship based upon the ideas of truth and justice which are a part of the code of all who accept the tenets of religion. The earnest and able principal of the Berkeley Temple (Boston) School of Applied Christianity, Professor Lawrence Phelps (a son of Professor Phelps, of Andover, of revered memory), will be the director of the department, the plans of which, not fully formulated, will include efforts to give unity of purpose and strength to the various activities already seeking to realize the ends in view, to enlist local religious organizations of adults and youth, and the members of all sects in suitable voluntary efforts for the realization of its objects, through conferences, studies, discussions, lectures, and judicious and practical activities. The Institute itself will bring to the aid of this department the valuable coöperation of its trustees, officers, and official associates, numbering, including its corps of lecturers and exclusive of the members generally, more than five hundred citizens of high abilities, residing in all parts of the country; and also the efficient aid of its official organ, whose title, as more consonant with its aims and more in accord with the scope of its special field, as announced by its publishers, will hereafter be *THE AMERICAN MAGAZINE OF CIVICS*.

The Institute's new department should have the coöperation of pastors and officers of churches, officers and members of Young Men's Christian Associations, Young People's Endeavor, Epworth League, and all other suitable religious organizations. Wise and helpful suggestions as to useful activities are promised through the *MAGAZINE OF CIVICS* and through specially prepared circulars; and the arrangements for giving success to the work generally are admirable. Only the efforts of willing co-operators are necessary in order to salutary and far-reaching results.

As indicated by the statistics presented in the November number of this magazine (page 560); the number of voters in the United States who may be supposed to be in full sympathy with the doctrines of duty in society as set forth in the teach-

ings of religion, is more than fifty-one per cent. Granting these conclusions, as the editor of the *Indiana Baptist* truly says, what a mighty moral force could be hurled against the evils threatening society if American voters would exercise the suffrage with that end in view! The question is not one of power to do, but of will and performance. Opportunity for useful coöperation on the part of those who have the will to speed the performance is offered, as above indicated, to all who would have the ethics of the Decalogue and the Golden Rule more fully applied in civic, social, and business affairs, and who will address "Director Department of Applied Ethics, Berkeley Temple, Boston," or "American Institute of Civics, New York." In this work, as in all of the activities of the Institute, dependence will be had upon voluntary coöperation without prescribed obligations. The patriotic altruism of which this national institution has so long been a tireless and successful exponent, should have its highest manifestation in this special field of endeavor.

H. R. WAITE.

THE PEOPLE'S PARTY.

BY C. W. WILEY.

THE last few years have produced a new political party in this country. It had its precursor about twenty years ago in the Greenback party. Since that time various mushroom and fungus political growths have sprung up and died away after brief and spasmodic existences. Such were the Granger party, the Farmers' Alliance, the F. M. B. A., and various labor and socialistic societies and groups. The Prohibition party can scarcely be included among the above political fungi.

In 1892, for the first time, some seeming order was brought out of the chaotic elements of the various bushwhacking factions mentioned, and something like a national organization effected. The new combination was christened the People's party. Since that time it has been gradually uniting, solidifying, and crystallizing, until it has almost reached the dignity of a national political organization. Formed of a heterogeneous multitude of diverse, disorganized, and antagonistic elements, the mass has been melted and fused sufficiently to enable one, to some extent, to analyze and classify it. Though it lacks cohesiveness, still a rough sketch is possible. I propose, in this paper, to make such a draft in the rough as reading, listening, and observation furnish. I have stood at a distance and laughed at them ; have argued with, ridiculed, and denounced them ; have listened to and seriously thought of them ; have discussed with them their principles and lack of principle ; and now propose to give the results. I write of them as they appear to me. If I fail to do them justice, it is because I have mistaken or misunderstood them, and not from motives of misstatement or malice.

In the first place, it is superfluous to say that the Populists are dissatisfied with present conditions, laws, and tendencies ;

and with the acts, principles, tendencies, and policies of the Democratic and Republican parties—radically, utterly, and irremediably. Not only those parties themselves, but their legislation, statutes, and leaders are renounced, denounced, and condemned. See their preliminary address to the people at the Omaha convention. They seem utterly and hopelessly irreconciled and irreconcilable to both the old parties. Especially is such the case in regard to the Republican party. With that party there can be no affiliation or coöperation. With the Democratic party of the South and West, there are some points of similarity and agreement.

To the Populist, the arch-enemy of mankind is John Sherman. He is closely followed, in that regard, by Grover Cleveland and Benjamin Harrison. The sources of all evil, distress, and corruption are Wall Street, New York, and Lombard Street, London. The Republican and Democratic leaders are the arch-fiends who carry into effect the behests of those streets. All other Republicans and Democrats, the rank and file, are mere slaves and dupes of the tyrants mentioned. The self-contained Populist has nothing but execration and wrath for the leaders, and pity and contempt for the slaves and dupes.

With their own ideas and theories, they are thoroughly infatuated. They have no doubt as to their inherent purity and correctness. Argue with them and prove by logic, history, and by their actual experiences that some or any of their vagaries are unsound, misleading, and false, and the next day or hour they are back at you with the same exploded doctrines, and unblushingly announce them as axiomatic truths. The most convincing arguments and proofs glide from them as darkness before the sun; and you are amazed to discover that they have made no impression. You might as well reason with a block of stone. They will confront you with a deluge of the most astounding statements, and if, after being convinced of their fiction and falsity, you take the pains to study the matter and to bring to them overwhelming proofs of their mistakes and misstatements, you will soon learn that your time has been utterly wasted. Your proofs will only be jeered at.

Your true Populist is a subject for psychological research and wonderment—baffling and discomfiting to mental classification and analysis. By all the rules of mental science and logic, your proofs should convince and vanquish him ; but they have no such effect. At the end of your most arduous efforts, if you can manage to keep him quiet long enough to listen to you, he will start in again in the same old way, with renewed and redoubled energy. Dissatisfied he is and disgruntled he will remain. He is bound to nurse his supposed grievances ; and the more he nurses them, the more violent he becomes.

The next most prominent characteristic of the regulation Populist is his violent and rabid hostility to the things that are. Everything is out of joint. After listening to his ravings, you will be surprised and grieved that one man should be, at so many points, so hostile and disaffected to the laws, institutions, and customs of his country. His opposition is not that of sorrow, meekness, and resignation, but of the loud and virulent variety. A man could not protest more vehemently if he were being robbed and despoiled by robbers and cut-throats. But it is when a number of them come together and air their sympathetic grievances that you see them at their worst. The president, Congress, legislatures, railroads, corporations, bankers, and business men are denounced and defamed in terms that make the listener blush for his race and humanity.

The unthinking, ignorant man falls an easy prey to these agitators. No matter how peacefully and contentedly he may have lived in this country year after year, these chronic grumblers will find a grievance for him and prove it by their own peculiar tracts and arguments. He listens and discovers that he has been wronged, although he did not know it. They soon convince him that his wrongs are legion and monstrous. He becomes dissatisfied and unhappy, and rails at his country and its laws to the satisfaction of his instructors. The common and inevitable dupe for conversion to the new faith is the victim of hard times or other misfortune. He becomes a sure prey, at first, and then an ardent advocate of the new faith. The milk of human kindness turns to gall and wormwood, and

the laws of his country become the causes of his misfortunes.

On every street corner you will find the wordy advocates and walking delegates of the new faith, finding fault with everything and everybody, waiting and watching for an opportunity to proselyte and convert new disciples to the cause. Their zeal, energy, and ingenuity are marvelous, and one cannot help but wish that the same could be expended to a useful and laudable purpose. In this respect, they much resemble the early Christians when trying to convert a world. Difficulties seem to please them ; no effort is spared ; time is not taken into account ; and business is neglected.

Whatever calamity or misfortune afflicts the people is used as a basis for adding new recruits. A failure of crops is welcomed as an aid to the cause. A strike, a lockout, a fall in wages, or depression in business, is used as a happy instrument to promote their interests and add to their numbers.

The Coxeyite lunacy was to them a harvest, and convincing proof of all they had maintained. The coal miners' strike, the Pullman boycott and attendant lawlessness seemed to them natural consequences of corporate cupidity and spoliation. They prophesied and many hoped that it was the beginning of a revolution. Frequent mention was made by many of the similarity of conditions existing in this country to those preceding the French Revolution. The action of courts and the military arm of the government in suppressing violence and compelling respect for law and order, was strongly denounced by them as unlawful and outrageous. The Populists were back of these troubles, encouraging and urging them on ; and as a result of such countenance and support, they expect and count on a large accession to their numbers. In fine, lawlessness and suffering seem pleasing to them ; while they would look on business revival and peace and contentment as calamitous.

The main accomplishment of the Populist is his knowledge of finance and political economy. There is where he "shines." What he does not know about finance and the financial management of this great nation is not worth knowing. The greatest minds of this and every other nation have been devoted to

solving the perplexing and knotty questions of national financial management. Many have made it the study of their lives. But the average Populist, however unlettered and untutored, will solve the most vexatious problems therein with a readiness, ease, and glibness that will astound one. He will point out all the errors that have existed from Alexander Hamilton to John G. Carlisle, and suggest improvements and corrections. Though he cannot successfully manage a small blacksmith shop, a peanut stand, a grocery store, or a forty acre farm, and will become hopelessly entangled therein, yet he will unravel the knottiest of national or international financial tangles with ease; and become exceedingly vexed and angry at any one who doubts his solution or questions its absolute correctness. He knows all the details and minutiae intuitively.

To the writer it was for a long time a puzzle where each and every member of this party gleaned their astounding and unheard of statistics and minutiae of detail. After a series of volumes of Populistic literature became known to him his wonder ceased. These works should be mentioned. By writers mostly unknown to fame, a number of volumes have been unloaded upon the public, at cheap prices, which the average Populist reads, quotes, and believes in with the implicit faith of the Puritan in his Bible. He does not question their astounding statements or doubt their truth and correctness. This Populistic literature is a marvel and a revelation to the uninitiated. In it men are vilified who deserve naught but praise. Men are praised who merit only contempt. Speeches and writings are so distorted, misinterpreted, and misrepresented that their authors would stand aghast at the uses made of them and the thoughts attributed to them. Such personages as Lincoln, Grant, Thad Stevens, Sumner, Garfield, Blaine, John Sherman, and others are made to father thoughts and sentiments they never heard or harbored; ideas so out of place, so unthought of, that they would never recognize their alleged authorship. All these are so interwoven, detached, changed, misinterpreted, and misrepresented, in such an interminable tangle, as totally to distort them from their original meaning and intent. After reading a

few of these volumes, no one need wonder at the crack-brained ideas of the average Populist. For the most part, they are a travesty on political economy and logic, and an outrage on facts and common sense.

Let some one spring a new theory of socialistic life, and the Populists at once adopt it. They do not inquire into its absurdities, or analyze its statements to sift out fact from fiction, or logic from unreason, but immediately repeat the statements as absolute verity. They never think of doubting the correctness of the ideas expressed in the works of Bellamy, Henry George, Ignatius Donnelly, and other of their authors, any more than does the student doubt the correctness of his arithmetic. Reason with them you cannot. To them their favorite authors are faultless and incapable of error.

If you dispute or ridicule their literature, you at once become in their eyes the agent or dupe of corporate wealth. However poor or honest you may be, they will not spare you. To disbelieve in their doctrines is treason to the "down-trodden millions," and you are denounced as a "minion of Wall Street."

Throughout the West, the Populists have added largely to their numbers by advocating the cause of free coinage of silver. By making this their main issue and keeping quiet on their numerous lunatic theories, they have received a much larger support than they otherwise would. Should they throw off their silver mask and openly espouse their socialistic and communistic doctrines, a large part of their numbers in that section would soon fall away. At present, "hard times" and business depression are their main support. When business resumes its normal aspect and prosperity again brightens the land, the voters will fall away from them like leaves from trees after autumnal frosts.

The rank and file of the party are mostly well-meaning, misled men, suffering under business depression, ready to grasp at any new thing that holds out a promise of betterment. False theories and teachings are their bane. Prosperity and sound doctrines will heal their disaffection. But back of these men is something more, something worse, something

deadly. Urging on dissatisfaction, lawlessness, and violence, are a lot of cowardly skulkers filled with mischief, disloyalty, and treason to the laws and customs of their country—men who have no respect for law or human rights; men who should feel the weight of law and justice; followers of Spies, Parsons, and Ling; men who take advantage of misery and distress to foment violence and lawlessness. These pernicious traitors to the laws and institutions of America prophecy revolution and bloodshed because they hope for such. They are now seeking to direct and control the new party. They seek first to make the people dissatisfied, then to disregard law and the authorities, then to come out in open violence and treason.

For this purpose they condemn both the old parties, claiming that Congress, legislatures, and courts are corrupt and that all laws are made and enforced in the interest of evil and against the welfare of the poor and honest. They seek first to undermine, then to overthrow.

Any close observer of Populist doctrines, speeches, and literature cannot fail to discover these instigators of evil working in and through the new party and striving to create trouble. By falsehood and slander they have already made their members dissatisfied. They have made them believe that present governmental powers and agencies are thoroughly corrupt and hostile to the common people. They have already caused them to look upon courts and military with suspicion and hostility. They have encouraged and sympathized with lawless outbreaks against authority.

Debs and his strike on the railways, McBride and his striking coal miners, Coxey and organized vagrancy, Waite and the Cripple Creek strikers, were all backed by the Populists, and attendant lawlessness and violence encouraged and approved. The party must soon call a halt to these treasonable indications within its ranks, or inevitable overthrow and disgrace soon await it. Such things cannot long continue. If its advocates hope to form a great party, fitted to take charge of the great and complex interests of this country, and administer them for the benefit of the common people, they must sternly repress

all indications of turbulence and lawlessness. One rebellion in this country has been enough for a good many years to come; and the hare-brained schemers and poisonous workers of evil who seek to overturn law by violence, will be put down with promptness and dispatch.

I do not wish to be understood as saying that anarchy is a principle of the People's party. But I do wish to say that it is or will be the result of present Populist teachings. The tendency is rapidly in that direction. The party must weed out the mischief-makers. The socialists, communists, and anarchists have already chosen that party for a home and harbor, and are using it to work out their designs, and as a means to disseminate their pernicious doctrines. The tone of many of the party, under these sinister influences, is fast becoming more violent and destructive. During the late labor troubles many members of the party were outspoken advocates of blood and revolution. They were really hanging over the precipice of treason. With present tendencies, I do not hesitate to say that it is very doubtful if one can be a full member of that party and a good citizen, at the same time. Should the sober, second-thought of the many honest and patriotic men of the party succeed in controlling the advocates of evil in their ranks and spew out the fanged adders that have affiliated with them, there are some hopes of the party's becoming a great national organization. But if such be not done and done soon, the party is doomed. A few more Waites, Lewellings, Pennoyers, Debs, and Sovereigns, placed in power and authority, and the party will be hopelessly ground to powder by public opinion at the ballot-box. Such mischief-makers should be relegated to the rear and to oblivion. Their control and leadership can only mean party ruin. The states now afflicted with their lawless rule are groaning with their burdens. Business is appalled with fear. Money refuses to go into their domains until purged of their follies. Respectable laborers and business men are ashamed and humiliated.

The worst feature of the party is its lack of level-headed leaders. If there are any such, they have failed to make them-

selves manifest. The party has been, up to date, the constant prey of violent demagogues and discredited politicians from the older parties. No party that is officered by conscienceless agitators and political mountebanks can hope to gain the confidence of the great American people. There is scarcely an ill-wisher of this country to-day to be found outside of the folds of the Populist party. It is an omen of the tendencies of that organization. The ultimate end of the party, with present sentiments and leadership, can only be extinction and disgrace. As soon as good times reappear and business revives, the party will die away. It was the product of distress and dissatisfaction, and when they cease, the party will go with them. Some of their principles will, doubtless, survive and be incorporated in a party that may have influence and standing in the nation. But that party will have to be under the control of wise leadership and intelligent patriotism. Parties of violence, discord, and lawlessness cannot endure. The Populist party has already gone so far in that direction that it will be almost a hopeless task to save it from destruction. So, as a party, I prophecy for it a speedy dissolution. Its short life has been unique and unsavory. Its hasty dissolution in death will be gladly welcomed by every lover of his country.

C. W. WILEY.

THE OUTLOOK.

A department devoted to notes and comments concerning affairs of interest to intelligent and patriotic citizens. Communications relating to local and other efforts for the improvement of governmental and social conditions, on the part of individuals or Municipal Reform, Good Government, Law and Order, and similar organizations, including ethical and religious efforts for the promotion of good citizenship, are especially invited. Address Outlook Department, American Journal of Politics, 38 Park Row, New York.

A "PATRIOTIC BOSS SYSTEM."—Dr. T. W. Braidwood, in an article in the *Vineland (N. J.) Journal*, says:

"If the people are convinced that bossism is an un-American concern, fertile in resources for municipal corruption, and therefore dangerous as well as being disgraceful to our professions of patriotism, let us at once take steps to organize permanent action to antagonize the action of Vineland's boss system.

"Under the inspiration of the American Institute of Civics, I have undertaken to introduce the 'Patriotic Boss System' in Vineland with a view to early coöperative action. The names of both ladies and gentlemen willing to work in the cause are respectfully requested."

CIVIC REFORM IN VARIOUS CITIES.—Several hundred Topeka, Kansas, citizens have adopted, with a view to immediate organization, the articles of the Philadelphia Municipal League, which appear elsewhere. . . . In Terre Haute, Indiana, a civic federation is in process of organization, its inception being chiefly due to the alarming spread of the evils attendant upon gambling. One of its active promoters is Rev. R. V. Hunter, of the Central Presbyterian church. . . . Galesburg, Illinois, has in effective operation a civic federation organized to combat serious evils in municipal administration. . . . Under the title of "Municipal Club" an organization of many of the representative citizens of Rochester, New York, devoted to the promotion of civic reforms, was effected October 17. Dr. E. M. Moore presided and trustees were chosen as follows: Theodore Bacon, Robert Matthews, Eugene Satterlee, Max Lowenthal, A. I. C., John Bower, Joseph O'Connor, A. I. C., Joseph T. Alling, Rev. Algernon S. Crapsey, Herman G. Pfaefflin. The constitution of the club vests in them a great share of authority in shaping and determining its policy. Addresses were made by Hon. Joseph O'Connor, A. I. C., Prof. John G. Allen, A. I. C., Rev. A. S. Crapsey, Joseph T. Alling, and Byron H. Prennett. Mr. O'Connor expressed some doubt as to the propriety of interfering as an organization with such matters as the nomination and election of public officers, and was inclined to think the best work of such a club would be in keeping strict watch over the course of the officers chosen, in spreading information as to city affairs, in discussing the unsettled problems in municipal government, and above all in striving to build up a harmonious public opinion in regard to public duty. . . . Syracuse, N. Y., also has

a newly organized civic club in the interests of better local government. One of its members, Mr. Nathaniel Bacon, aided in the organization of the Rochester club. . . . The Cleveland (Ohio) *World* announces the formation of a civic federation in that city, following a meeting of laymen and clergymen at the rooms of the Y. M. C. A., with objects as follows: "To promote a federation of the moral forces of the city, regardless of sect, party, or circumstance in life, with a view of stimulating the civic spirit of our people, ameliorating the existing conditions, social, sanitary, and political, and, in general, by sympathetic coöperation with the city officials, fostering the administration of municipal affairs upon business rather than political methods." Representatives of Christian Endeavor Societies, the Central Labor Union, and Knights of Labor were present. Among the leading promoters of this promising movement are Gen. James Barnett, A. I. C., Rev. Hiram C. Haydn, D.D., A. I. C., J. E. Cheeseman, Robert Bondlow, and Rev. Levi Gilbert, D.D. . . . A joint committee of the civic reform clubs of Chicago on October 13 met to discuss needed legislation for the welfare of the children of that city. There were present J. S. Miller, Prof. Edward W. Bemis, A. I. C., Prof. Bamberger, Judge H. B. Hurd, Judge Willis G. Jackson, A. I. C., Dr. Sarah H. Stevenson, and Miss Jane Adams. A committee was appointed to draft a law providing for a special court for juvenile delinquents. . . . A new feature of the late local political campaign in Buffalo, N. Y., was the Good Government clubs in the various wards, after the plan which has been adopted so extensively in New York and Brooklyn. The motto of the originators of the movement is "Municipal government is business, not politics." . . . The organization of a civic federation to secure the enforcement of law in Toledo, Ohio, is also assured. It is the outgrowth of the enormous number of gambling houses and wine-rooms in the city and the open violation of the Sunday law. Articles of incorporation were filed October 10 at Columbus and the executive committee here is mapping out work for a vigorous campaign. The name of the organization as incorporated is, "The Citizens' Federation of the City of Toledo," and its incorporators are: Norman S. Lewis, Charles L. France, John L. Brandt, James H. Sprague, and Edgar P. Mull. The object is "to promote good citizenship, to encourage the enforcement of national, state, and municipal laws, to assist and insist upon the maintenance of the same and to promote the public good." . . . Joseph Packard, Jr., president of the Baltimore Reform League, recently delivered an address before the "Unit Club," also a reform organization, in which he said, among other true things, that the hope for improvement in government lies in keeping national, state, and city issues entirely apart. . . . A number of Camden gentlemen interested in topics of the day met in Mayor Westcott's office, in the City Hall, October 10th, and organized the Civic Club. The club will have monthly discussions, with a dinner as accessory. This club does not confine itself wholly to reform matters, but will discuss literature and current events. . . . The Municipal Order League of Chicago has taken action on street begging as follows:

"Whereas, We deem the subjection of young children and infants to the severe cold of winter for such purpose a cruel and inhuman practice.

"Whereas, Investigation reveals the fact that many of these children are hired out by mothers to other women for the express purpose of obtaining money from a sympathetic and unsuspecting public, thereby provoking unjust criticism toward our city fathers, who, we fully believe, will see no mother and babe suffer for food and shelter.

"Whereas, We believe such public demonstrations have a tendency to lessen rather than increase the protective spirit of man toward recent motherhood (especially when it is the mother who begs), thereby endangering the lives of both. Be it

"Resolved, That the Municipal Order League encourage and tender their support to the city officials in carrying out the letter of the law toward such offenders; as also, all girls under sixteen years of age found soliciting alms or selling any kind of thing on the streets after six o'clock in the evening; and that a building be procured for the detention and relief of such cases, and also all mothers and young children who may need assistance, said building to be maintained by civic appropriations."

CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP INSTRUCTION.—Among the "Workers' Training Classes" of the Dayton, O., Y. M. C. A. is a "Christian Citizenship Class," which meets each Sabbath evening after a simple lunch provided by the Association, closing in time for the young people's meetings. The plans, as announced by the secretary, Evert G. Rontzahn, are as follows: The course of study will cover a series of "Problems of the New Era," including the elementary phases of "Citizenship," with the resultant relationships to various ethical and reform questions; all subjects being investigated and discussed from the Biblical standpoint in an earnest endeavor to apply Christ's teaching to present day problems.

The following twelve problems with their local application will be studied on the basis of Dr. Josiah Strong's "Our Country" and "The New Era," and the series of "Studies" prepared by Prof. Graham Taylor for the *Young Men's Era*:

The Problem of the Country Town, of the City Center, of Immigration, of Industrial Life, of Sunday Rest and the Working Day, of Poverty, of Crime, of the Liquor Power, of Social Vice, of Luxury, of the Local Church, and of Christian Coöperation.

The class sessions will embrace topical discussion; sentence reports of reading, thought, and observation; question box for the treatment of varied queries.

The reading course will include, first, the reading of a standard periodical, of the person's choice, with a view to securing material for these studies.

Bright, brief, and breezy pamphlet issues will be supplied weekly, accompanied by simple question blanks for securing a closer reading and more thoughtful consideration of the literature. The second part of this scheme includes the organization of auxiliary classes, with or without meetings for class study, in every church, with the members of the Association as mediums of communication and inspiration. If possible, class meetings should be held regularly, if but thirty minutes. At least secure a circle of readers studying regularly, as suggested above, standard periodicals, and the weekly pamphlet issues and study slips, for which ten cents a week will be contributed by each member.

ARTICLES OF PHILADELPHIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE.—In response to requests for a suitable form of organization for municipal reform associations, we present the articles of the Philadelphia Municipal League as follows, omitting the name of that city:

"We, the members of the Municipal League of . . . inviting the co-operation of all our fellow-citizens, hereby declare and pledge ourselves to the enforcement of the following principles:

"First—We believe that the highest principles of municipal self-government in the United States will be materially promoted by the absolute separation of municipal politics from national and state politics.

"Two—The material prosperity of all citizens residing or having business interests in the city of . . . depends, in great measure, upon the honest and efficient conduct of its government by enlightened methods and upon business principles. . . . should have the most improved system of taxes, of street-paving, of lighting, of water, of drainage, of schools, of transit, and all other public necessities and conveniences. To secure these results will be the incessant aim of the Municipal League of . . .

"Three—We pledge ourselves to nominate or indorse only such candidates as we believe to be honest and capable and in sympathy with the principle of absolute separation of municipal from state and national politics.

"Four—We advocate the practical extension of the highest principles of civil service reform to all municipal departments, and demand a rigorous observance of all laws and regulations concerning appointments to and removals from the municipal civil service.

"Five—It will be the special object of the Municipal League of . . . to make a thorough and scientific investigation of the correct principles of local self-government, especially as adapted to this municipality, and to collect and publish all appropriate information on the defects and needs of our city government. While the members of the league may be members of widely different national or state organizations, all will be united in the common purpose of obtaining the best city government for the wisest expenditure of money, of advancing the material growth of the municipality, and of stimulating that spirit of progress in her citizens which will secure for them and their descendants the largest measure of domestic comfort and of commercial prosperity."

The methods as set forth in the by-laws are as follows :

1. Educational—By demonstrating to the public the advantages to be derived from the absolute separation of national and state politics from municipal politics ; and by the publication of a series of tracts on municipal affairs.

2. Practical — By nominating candidates, when necessary, who are pledged to carry out the declaration of principles of the league.

The by-laws provide that any one who subscribes to the declaration of principles may become a member. The management is intrusted to the customary officers and a board of managers composed of one delegate from each ward and a specified number at large.

Public officers are not denied membership and the only provision is the following: "No person shall accept or hold a nomination, election, or appointment to any municipal or public office to which a salary is attached and at the same time be an officer or manager of the league."

THE TRIUMPH OF GOOD CITIZENSHIP IN NEW YORK.—Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst, D.D., to whom more than to any other individual is due by common verdict the magnificent triumph of good citizenship achieved in New York on November 6th, penned these characteristic words for publication in the *New York Press* on the morning following the great victory :

"This day marks an epoch in the history of our city, and, more than that, in the history of our state and country. The hearts of the people are profoundly stirred. Their eyes have been opened to the possibility of better things. The distressed and downtrodden had been so long ground under the hard, dirty heel of the vicious beast that has preyed upon them that they

had come to feel that it was a constituent part of municipal life to be bled and clubbed and blackmailed. But the suspicion has been growing even in the minds of the oppressed and the outcast that there are such things as rights and personal liberty, that the police are properly for the protection even of the poor and the ignorant, and that the courts were really intended originally to secure to us comfort and peace and protection. These ideas have been growing in the popular mind, and at length they have attained to flower and fruitage. The mass of our population has learned a long, deep lesson, and a month will not pass before hosts of those who have served and slaved at the bidding of Tammany will rejoice with us at the crisis in our history which opens for them the door to a larger liberty and initiates our city into a new and brighter stadium of its history."

The mayor-elect, Hon. William L. Strong, justifies the hopeful words of Dr. Parkhurst by the following words uttered on the same day:

"The patriotic citizens of New York have decided by an overwhelming majority that they want a business, non-partisan administration of municipal affairs. As mayor of New York I shall faithfully carry out, to the best of my ability, the pledge which I made in the beginning of the campaign, to give the people an administration of this kind. In accepting the trust conferred upon me I am grateful for the support of my fellow-citizens and deeply sensible of the magnitude and importance of the task which confronts a reform city government."

FREE INSTITUTIONS VINDICATED.—Henceforth let no American citizen ever despair of the republic or doubt the endurance of representative institutions. Yesterday's magnificent uprising in this city triumphantly delivered popular government from the sneers of its enemies and the fears of its friends. It has long been acknowledged by enlightened minds that the one supreme test of free institutions was in the administration of the affairs of great municipalities. For years New York, oppressed by bossism, degraded by the reign of crime, ruled by the most perfectly disciplined and the most absolutely corrupt political machine ever fashioned by man, has been an object of scorn to the adherents of monarchy and a source of deep humiliation to the upholders of civic freedom. Tammany has seemed omnipotent. It had ten thousand saloons as its recruiting quarters and its centers of power. It had an army of twenty thousand servile office-holders drawing fifteen millions in salaries annually, as its Prætorian Guard. It had the active support of all the dens of vice and the eager help of all the criminals whom it protected. It had a vast corruption fund at its disposal, drawn alike from the pocket of the lawbreaker and the till of the honest merchant. Timid men said that its malignant reign could never be overthrown. They forgot the invincible power of right. They did not measure the irresistible might of the awakened American conscience.

To-day New York is free by the act of her own citizens. The voters of the metropolis have battered down by their ballots the political despotism that had plundered them so long and have proclaimed anew the immortal doctrines of that Declaration of Independence which is the charter of American liberty. Republican government has vindicated itself in the stronghold of its enemies and triumphed gloriously over obstacles greater than any which it has encountered in the history of the world. For this vindication and this deliverance every loyal American has reason to rejoice with joy unspeakable, to look forward to the future with renewed faith and courage, and to return thanks with all reverence and all sincerity to Almighty God!—*New York Press.*

NEW YORK CLERGYMEN AND CIVICS.—At the last meeting of the Synod of New York, Rev. C. L. Thompson, D.D., A. I. C., made a stirring appeal for greater interest in the moral purification of the great centers of population and the use of the ballot-box by Christian men for the suppression of vice and crime. Clergymen of all denominations in the city and state of New York are giving unwonted attention to the obligations of Christian citizenship. Foremost among these are such members of the A. I. C. as Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst, who has been called "the John Knox of modern times," Dr. C. L. Thompson, Dr. Greer, Dr. Lyman Abbott, Bishop Cox, Dr. John R. Davies, John B. Devins, Dr. Elmendorf, Dr. Chas. H. Hall, Dr. R. S. MacArthur, Dr. H. T. McEwen, Dr. D. Parker Morgan, A. F. Newton, Geo. S. Payson, Dr. Rainsford, Dr. H. M. Sanders, Dr. J. B. Shaw, Dr. John T. Wilds, and Alfred E. Myers.

DR. SEELYE ON CITIZENSHIP.—Rev. Dr. Julius H. Seeleye, A. I. C., a former president of Amherst College and ex-member of Congress, has published through Ginn & Co., of Boston, an attractive little book of 78 pages for "classes in government and law" under the title of "Citizenship." Its chief aim is to treat briefly and suggestively of the rights and duties of citizens as defined by statutes. Citizenship is viewed broadly as including both international and national law. This little treatise is commended to the attention of clubs pursuing studies in connection with the Extension Department of the A. I. C. and other organizations having similar ends in view.

ST. LOUIS POLITICAL SCIENCE CLUB.—This club, devoted to the study of the questions of the day without committal to any special attitude in politics or religion, announces lecture topics as follows: By Hon. John W. Noble, formerly member of cabinet, "Duties and Work of a Member of the President's Cabinet"; by Ex-Governor David R. Francis (Mo.) "Duties and Work of a State Governor"; Ex-Mayor C. P. Walbridge treats of the "Duties of a City Mayor"; Charles Nagel, A. I. C., speaks upon "The City Charter of St. Louis, its History, and How it May be Improved"; Hon. S. W. Cobb, M. C., treats of "Life in Congress"; Charles Parsons, of the "Banking System"; Hon. Geo. A. Medill of "The U. S. Supreme Court"; and Prof. Hicks, of the University of Missouri, of important questions in economics. W. L. Sheldon, lecturer of the Ethical Society of St. Louis, is the literary director of the club, and George E. Hoffman, La Clide Bank, secretary.

NEGRO EDUCATION SINCE 1860.—This is the title of an instructive pamphlet by Hon. J. L. McCurry, LL.D., A. I. C., the able secretary of the Slater and Peabody Funds. It constitutes the third of occasional papers issued by the trustees of the Slater Fund, and is an invaluable contribution to the educational history of the former slave states.

CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP UNION.—This is the title of an organization in Newark, N. J., embracing all the Christian Endeavor Societies, Epworth Leagues, Baptist Young People's Unions, and the Iron Cross Army. It undertakes, "in the Master's name, the betterment of the whole city by adding to the usual efforts in the various churches the combined effect of a general organization devoted to the enforcement of Christian principles in public affairs."

It appeals simply to the Christian conscience of its membership and to the moral and patriotic element in the non-Christian portion of the citizens; strives to remove from the city temptations to vice, to effect the repeal of legislation by which such temptations are permitted; and attempts to check the purchasing of votes and other abuses connected with the ballot-box.

It also urges Christian people to attend the primaries of their parties and insist upon the nomination for office of men who are in sympathy with the object of the organization; submits to the proper authorities evidence to convict officials who are recreant to the trusts confided to them by the people; and collates for the convenience of pastors and the information of the Christian public, important data concerning the moral and religious condition of the city.

The union declines to indorse any political party or support any independent nomination for office.

EXTENSION DEPARTMENT A. I. C.—*Public Opinion*, whose excellent features are manifold, has undertaken to devote an entire page each week to civics, in connection with the Extension Department of the A. I. C. It opened this new feature with the following brief article prepared at the request of its manager by the president of the A. I. C.:

The Extension Department of the American Institute of Civics, as indicated by the previous announcements, is intended to be an efficient and far-reaching means for the accomplishment of clearly defined ends. If success is dependent upon the worthiness of these ends there can be no doubt as to its assurance. It is not to be forgotten, however, that the achievement of the Institute's patriotic and vitally important objects is wholly dependent upon the unselfish and vigorous coöperation of intelligent and high-minded citizens. The number of such citizens already rendering willing and efficient service in connection with the local organizations belonging to the Institute's Extension Department, is a hopeful augury. As an incitement to more earnest effort on their part, and as an encouragement to like efforts on the part of others, careful attention is invited to the following statements:

Among the self-evident truths related to the highest success of popular government are these:

(1) The suffrage, by which an equal share in the powers and responsibilities of government is devolved upon every voter, makes each suffragist a trustee, charged with the sacred duty of rightly using the power confided to him.

(2) As the right use of this power involves the most sacred obligations ever committed to human hands—the power of determining the character of government, and the consequent well-being of all citizens in all communities—it is of the utmost importance, in truth vitally necessary, that the number of patriotic, honest, and intelligent "trustees" in every community be sufficient to prevent the political ascendancy of those who traitorously use their trusteeship and that of others for the gaining of the mercenary ends by which government is debauched, politics defiled, law and order contemned, and the moral and material welfare of the whole people put in jeopardy.

(3) Past and present shameful conditions in connection with affairs of government, local and general, emphasize the fact that honest, wise, and safe control of political matters in a community cannot be expected as a result of blind devotion to any political party; will not follow mere expressions of dissatisfaction, or outbursts of popular indignation; but must be the re-

sult of organized, persistent, unselfish, and wisely directed efforts which shall everywhere secure the ascendancy of good citizenship.

(4) Good citizenship, ascendant in any community, means decency and cleanliness in party politics, honesty and efficiency in public office, reverence for law, social purity, the highest welfare of the whole people, and the steady march of popular government toward the realization of its noblest ideals.

(5) The good citizenship which will alone lead to these results demands that every American voter—each citizen trustee—shall have a proper sense of civic obligations, a secure foundation in right character, an adequate degree of intelligence as to civic affairs, and definite and determined purposes. The promotion of such citizenship is the object sought by the Extension Department of the American Institute of Civics. The work is one which appeals to, and must be accomplished by, good citizens. There should be, in every locality, an organization devoted to the one specific purpose of arousing genuine patriotism; strengthening the structure of politics with the supports of high character and worthy purposes, and assuring wise outcome of popular suffrage, by making the voter intelligent as to the issues involved, and faithful to proper convictions of duty.

Faithful and persistent efforts for the securing of such results as these will accomplish a political regeneration by making parties what they should be, noble instruments for the execution of the will of intelligent and honest freemen, and will banish everywhere the evils of corruption in politics and government. Here is a call to duty which it will be criminal to disregard. The work is one which ought to present a resistless appeal to the manhood and womanhood of America. Especially should it command the labors of the younger citizens who have most of strength and enthusiasm, and opportunity for longest and largest service. Let us make, in the best sense of the term, good citizens of those born upon our soil, and those who come to us from other lands, and the problems which vex and the evils which menace us to-day will have their solution. We shall have taught, with incalculable benefit to coming generations, that formation is better than reformation, by as much as the results of civic virtue nourished and triumphant are better than those painfully obtained through remedial agencies when civic virtue is neglected and overcome.—*Henry Randall Waite.*

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED ETHICS, A. I. C.—“Applied ethics,” from the point of view of an American citizen, may simply be defined as the practical observance of the duties which citizens owe to each other and to organized society. These duties obviously extend over a wide range of sociological relations, and may be made the subject of attention from numerous points of view, as when attempts are made to consider sociology as a whole.

Such attempts by inviting generalization too often defeat the accomplishment of definite and practical results. Civics embraces all of sociology which has relation to the duties of a member of society under our republican form of government and in connection with society and institutions in the United States. It suggests and invites the consideration of definite and important matters which vitally concern the welfare of American citizens, society, and government. Civics, therefore, commends itself to intelligent and patriotic Americans as calculated to lead to more practical and useful results than can be expected from generalized attention to the wide subject of sociology. More than this, civics gives to the ideas and principles of ethics the foremost place in the correlated facts with which it has to do, and

which (civil polity, law, economics, ethics, and history) are included in the "science which concerns itself with the reciprocal relations of citizens and government."

In its Department of Applied Ethics, it is the purpose of the Institute of Civics to secure larger attention on the part of the American people, and especially of educators, journalists, clergymen, and citizens who profess allegiance to the truths of religion, to the necessity of developing and applying the qualities in citizenship—the integrity, fidelity to duty, and practical altruism—which shall make applied ethics contributory to good citizenship and to the realization of the noblest ends in government.

The statement above presented sufficiently indicates the importance of the results to which this department is intended to contribute. In order to the supremacy of good citizenship it is necessary to promote, with civic intelligence, "love of justice, sense of duty, and instinct of honor."* Where these exist, righteous laws will not readily be profaned, social order will be easily maintained, and society and government will be at their best.

The trustees of the Institute have been fortunate in securing the coöperation, as the director of this new department, of Rev. Lawrence Phelps, principal of the Berkeley Temple (Boston) Institute of Applied Christianity. The splendid success of the pioneer work undertaken by the Berkeley Temple under the leadership of the Rev. Charles A. Dickinson (member A. I. C.), in the way of giving practical application to ethical principles in the midst of the crowded population of one of the most densely inhabited districts of Boston, is everywhere known, and is everywhere stimulating like efforts. To aid in promoting the success of these awakened and multiplying agencies in all that they shall seek to do in the way of laying the foundation for better citizenship, will be the foremost aim of this department; and in the accomplishment of this aim the Institute asks the coöperation of its members, and of all others who appreciate the importance of the results sought. In this connection, valuable service will be rendered by the Institute's corps of lecturers; and helpful plans and suggestions will be presented in the Institute's official organ, and in other forms. Inquiries may be addressed to the Executive Offices of the Institute, 38 Park Row, New York, or to the Rev. Lawrence Phelps, Director Department of Applied Ethics, A. I. C., Berkeley Temple, Institute of Applied Christianity, Station A., Boston, Mass.

COST OF CITY GOVERNMENT.—It will surprise many people to learn that the expenditures on municipal account aggregate three times as much as the sum required to conduct the affairs of all the states and territories. It is in the cities that the heaviest tribute is exacted from property owners. The municipal machinery is more expensive than any other in our whole system of government. When the people complain of high taxes, they do not stop to discriminate between the different kinds of taxation, and to ascertain where the blame properly belongs. There is really no justification for protest as to federal taxes, and very little as to state taxes; but it is different with regard to city taxes. This fact should induce all good citizens to give particular attention to the selection of municipal officers.—*St. Louis Globe-Democrat.*

* Institute publications, "Supremacy of Good Citizenship," page 2.

INDEX TO VOL. V.

JULY TO DECEMBER, 1894.

- Administration, The First Year of, 271.
- American Institute of Civics, 56, 220.
- Anarchical Elements in Society, 337.
- Arbitration, Compulsory, 487.
- Australia and the American Continent, 312.
- Barrett, Jay A. Civics in Public Schools, 171.
- Bartlett, Hamilton M. The Study of the Problems of the Day, 306.
- Bemis, Edward W. Civics in Public Schools, 171.
- Benton, Charles E. The Conditions and Prospects of the American Farmer, 248.
- Bliss, H. L. Our Misleading Census Statistics, 417.
- Boston Municipal League, 1.
- Bridgman, Raymond L. Legislatures: A Defense and a Criticism, 598.
- Brokaw, W. E. The Law of Service, 370.
- Budd, Henry. The Limits of Party Obligation, 122.
- Burchard, E. M. Economic Co-operation, 278. A Labor Trust, 634.
- Burleigh, Florence A. How to Abolish Poverty, 530.
- Business Crises and Commercial Depressions, 449.
- Capen, Samuel B. The Boston Municipal League, 1.
- Carver, Thomas Nixon. Malthus at the Hands of Recent Critics, 535.
- Census Statistics, Our Misleading, 417.
- Chino-Japanese War, 561.
- Christianity in Our National Life, 25.
- Churches, Military Instruction in, 205.
- Citizenship, 225.
- City Government, 67.
- Civics, American Institute of, 56, 220.
- Civics, A Practical Example in, 617.
- Civics in Public Schools, 171.
- Clement, Ernest W. The Foreign Policy of Japan, 408.
- Colleges, Military Instruction in, 205.
- Commercial Depressions, 449.
- Cooley, Stoughton. Economic Co-operation, 429.
- Cooperation, Economic, 278, 429.
- Cox, Theodore. The Problem of Poverty, 301.
- Dennis, T. Fletcher. The Lawyer from a Moral Standpoint, 76.
- Denslow, Albert E. The Functions of Government, 257.
- Eaton, Charles H. Pullman and Paternalism, 571.
- Evans, Ira H. Good Citizenship, 225.
- Farmer, The Conditions and Prospects of, 248.
- Farquhar, A. B. and H. The Panic and the Silver Movement, 84.
- Federal Intervention, 266.
- Ferrero, William. Anarchical Elements in Society, 337.
- Fredericksen, D. M. Compulsory Arbitration, 487.
- Gary, George. A Proposed Remedy for Railroad Troubles, 641.
- Gorton, Elliot. The Insane and Hospitals for Their Care, 140.
- Government by Parties, 295.
- Government, City, 67.
- Government, Functions of, 257.
- Government, Popular, in Antiquity, 381.
- Grant, Thomas Burke. A New Ireland in America, 30. Pullman and Its Lessons, 190. The Republic in the Court of Reason, 580.
- Hale, Edward Everett. The Abolition of Pauperism, 113.
- Hamilton, F. W. A Patriotic Pulpit, 14.
- Haskins, Thomas W. A Practical Example in Civics, 617.
- Hopkins, J. Castell. The Senate and the Lords: A Comparison, 461.
- Howe, Frederic Clemson. Commercial Depressions and Business Crises, 449.
- Indiscriminate Immigration, The Burden of, 608.
- Insane, and Hospitals for Their Care, 140.
- Ireland in America, 30.
- Japan, The Foreign Policy of, 408.
- Kitson, Arthur. A Criticism of Henry George's Single Tax Theory, 350.
- Kittrell, Thomas G. Government by Parties, 295.
- Know-nothingism, Threatened Revival of, 504.
- Labor's Claims, 496.
- Labor Leader, The Place of the, 152.

- Labor Trust, A, 634.
 Laughlin, G. H. Civics in Public Schools, 171.
 Laws, Patent, 543.
 Lawyer, The, From a Moral Standpoint, 76.
 Legislatures: A Defense and Criticism, 598.
 Love, Alfred H. Military Instruction in Schools, Colleges, and Churches, 205.
 Malthus at the Hands of Recent Critics, 535.
 Mason, J. W. Pullman and Its Real Lessons, 392.
 McCreary, E. D. Strikes From an Economic Standpoint, 241.
 Mead, Edwin. Our Silver Experiment, 399.
 Military Instruction in Schools, Colleges, and Churches, 205.
 Milton, G. F. Dangers of Paternalism, 625.
 Money, The Functions of, 470.
 Morse, F. A. Civics in Public Schools, 171.
 Moses, Adolph. Popular Government: Its Development and Failure in Antiquity, 381.
 Mowry, Duane. The First Year of the Administration: A Reply, 271.
 Municipal Leagues, 1, 287.
 Myers, George L. The Truth About Australia and the American Continent, 312.
 Olerich, H. Are Our Patent Laws Iniquitous? 543.
 Outlook, 90, 212, 320, 440, 555, 660.
 Panic, The, and the Silver Movement, 84.
 Party Government, 295.
 Party Obligation, The Limits of, 122.
 Patent Laws, 543.
 Paternalism, Dangers of, 625.
 Pauperism, The Abolition of, 113.
 People's Party, The, 651.
 Philadelphia Municipal League, 287.
 Poverty, How to Abolish, 530.
 Poverty, The Problem of, 301.
 Problems of the Day, The Study of, 306.
 Pullman and Its Lessons, 190, 392.
 Pullman and Paternalism, 571.
 Pulpit, A Patriotic, 14.
 Quartermass, W. W. Federal Intervention, 266.
 Railroad Troubles, A Proposed Remedy for, 641.
 Rector, E. L. The Functions of Money, 470.
 Religion Carried into Citizenship, 645.
 Republic, The, in the Court of Reason 580.
 Robinson, Charles. The Threatened Revival of Knownothingism, 504.
 Russell, Ernest E. A Non-partisan View of the Tariff Situation and Outlook, 526.
 Schaumburg, Atkinson. Woman Suffrage, 412.
 Schools, Civics in, 171.
 Schools, Military Instruction in, 205.
 Senate, The, and the Lords: A Comparison, 461.
 Service, Law of, 370.
 Sheldon, W. L. The Place of the Labor Leader, 152.
 Silver Movement and the Panic, 84.
 Silver, Our, Experiment, 399.
 Strikes From an Economic Standpoint, 241.
 Suffrage, Woman, 412.
 Swain, H. H. Civics in Public Schools, 171.
 Tariff, A Non-partisan View of the, 526.
 Tax, Single, Criticism of, 350.
 Trust, A Labor, 634.
 Twells, Julia H. The Burden of Indiscriminate Immigration, 608.
 Von Holst's Awakening, 496.
 Waite, Henry Randall. American Institute of Civics, 56. Religion Carried into Citizenship, 645.
 W. C. T. U., Fallacy of, 479.
 Welsh, Herbert. The Movement for Good City Government, 67.
 Wiley, C. W. The People's Party, 651.
 Williams, B. W. Christianity in Our National Life, 25.
 Wilson, George G. Civics in Public Schools, 171.
 Winston, Ella W. A Fallacy of the W. C. T. U., 479.
 Woman Suffrage, 412.
 Woodruff, Clinton Rogers. The Philadelphia Municipal League, 287.
 Wool, Theodore J. Civics in Public Schools, 171.
 Yarros, Victor. Historian Von Holst's Awakening: Are Labor Claims Anti-Social? 496.
 Yokoi, J. T. The Chino-Japanese War and the Eastern Problems, 561.

GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



ALF Collections Vault



3 0000 089 196 426